Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

The contest over the control of the nineteenth-century universities of Scotland and England

Thesis

How to cite:

Cameron, Donald MacIver (1987). The contest over the control of the nineteenth-century universities of Scotland and England. PhD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see FAQs.

© 1987 The Author

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21954/ou.ro.0000d3b5

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data policy on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

31 0129310 X

DX 75962/87

UNRESTRICTED

D O N A L D M A C I V E R C A M E R O N, B. E D.

THE CONTEST OVER THE CONTROL OF THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY UNIVERSITIES OF SCOTLAND AND ENGLAND

OPEN UNIVERSITY
20 OCTOBER
LIBRARY

PH.D.

HISTORY OF EDUCATION

31ST. OCTOBER 1986

Author's number: HDJ 0483
Date of submission: 5.11.86
Date of award: 24 August 1987

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
THE OPEN UNIVERSITY
MILTON KEYNES

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

EX35

HIGHER DEGREES OFFICE

LIBRARY AUTHORISATION

STUDENT: James Maciver Cameron SERIAL NO: .....

DEGREE: Ph.D.

TITLE OF THESIS: The Contest over the Control of the Nineteenth-Century Universities of Scotland and England

I confirm that I am willing that my thesis be made available to readers and may be photocopied, subject to the discretion of the Librarian.

Signed: J M Cameron Date: 31.11.86

Abstract

This thesis studies the reform of the nineteenth century universities of Scotland and England in terms of the conflict between the aristocracy, the professions and the mercantile section of the middle class. A methodology has been developed that draws on the secondary sources on the universities to identify the main characters involved in certain debates relating to university reform. The work consists of the study of the original correspondence of the central persons involved in specific changes in the two university systems. These sources have been set into a context constructed from the study of newspaper reports, pamphlets, essays, speeches and other accessible pieces. A background chapter on the main contrasts between the university systems in Scotland and England in the years before the Victorian age is followed by three chapters that focus on parellel developments in the two university systems in three distinct periods. By juxtaposing the events in (1) the 1820s and 1830s, (2) the 1850s and (3) the 1870s and 1880s the thesis indicates that differences in the reforms of the various parts of the systems in the two countries can be related to the resolution of local compromises between the aristocracy, the professions and the mercantile wing of the middle class that reflected the relative strength of those classes in the local areas. By concentrating on events in this way the thesis draws conclusions which cast doubt on the analysis presented by G.E. Davie in his work 'The Democratic Intellect'. The study concludes that the ideas associated with the three identified contending interest groups had a divergent impact on Oxford and Cambridge, on the universities of Scotland and on the newer civic universities as the century unfolded.

C O N T E N T S

Page

Chapter One

Introduction

In this thesis I will provide an account of certain important reforms of the universities in both Scotland and England in the nineteenth century in order to identify those features that influenced the control and direction of the reform on the universities. In particular I intend to concentrate on the study of the way in which the different university traditions in Scotland and England at the beginning of the century were altered to form a 'British' university system by the end of the century. A central consideration in this work will be an examination of the idea, suggested by G.E. Davie in 'The Democratic Intellect', that the Scottish university tradition was 'anglicized' during the nineteenth century.

The working hypothesis of this thesis is that the reforms of the Scottish and English university systems in the last century can be understood in terms of the complex changes in the relationships between the educational ideas associated with three key groups -the aristocracy, the professions and the mercantile section of the middle class. I intend to show that if viewed in this way we may observe the impact of such events as the alteration in the linkage between the church and the state, the enfranchisement of the middle classes and the changes in the perception of the relationship between education and industrial performance on the universities in the course of the century. It will be shown that the changing sets of social relations were inextricably linked with and reinforced by changes in the shape and form of the universities and that enduring cultural differences between Scotland and England led to the preservation of a university tradition in Scotland that suited local needs and fitted in with local ideas about higher education.

In this chapter I will outline the shifts in my thinking that have led to the development of the perspective offered in the main part of this thesis. This will be followed by a consideration of the methodology adopted in this work and to a statement of the frame of reference of the study which will try to establish the lines of the differences between the ideas associated with the aristocracy, the professions, and the mercantile wing of the middle class. And, finally, the chapter will examine the relationship of the planned study to the existing research in this field. This section will contain a brief introductory essay on 'The Democratic Intellect' by G.E. Davie which will focus on the contribution of that work to the interests and form of this thesis.

Development of a Perspective

Whilst working for an Advanced Diploma in Education in Developing Countries and Comparative Education I became aware that quite a number of the studies of the educational systems of Asia, Africa and Latin America concluded with the axiom that those systems were the products of colonial rule or of the impact of neo-colonialism.

It seemed to me that an interest in this facet of these works was all too often frustrated in so far as many of the studies were unable to shed much light on the identification of the factors or processes which facilitated the transfer of educational ideas. In some cases these works lacked a firm base from which a perspective on the economic, social and political aspects of the interaction between the various parts of the world could be viewed. In others the problem seemed to be that the authors concentrated on description rather than analysis. The end result tended to be that little effort was made to discern overall patterns of educational transfer.

In seeking to understand the difficulties faced by writers trying to get to grips with the study of contemporary examples of educational transfer of ideas I came to think that one of the central problems arose out of the inaccessible and confidential nature of the deliberations of those at the centre of the decision-making procedure. For example, anybody wishing to study the impact of British ideas on Third World countries is likely to want access to documents which will be stored in ministry vaults for another twenty or thirty years before being released.

During the year I spent studying for my Advanced Diploma it occured to me that there might be some interesting parallels between

these modern cases of educational transfer and the matters raised by George Davie in his book on 'The Democratic Intellect: Scotland and her Universities in the Nineteenth Century.' A few years previously when I had first read Davie's work it had struck me as being of great value in that it dealt in some detail with empirical data that was relevent to interests that were usually covered in purely theoretical terms in the sociological literature. At this point I had a vague notion that the data dealt with by Davie or, more generally, the study of Scottish education viz-a-viz English education could form part of an interesting work that connected the relationships between nations with the study of educational transfer.

When I originally tried to put these vague ideas into the form of a coherent research proposal I formulated an ambitious scheme that involved juxtaposing the English/Scottish case against another case of educational transfer located within Europe. The intention was to link the study of educational transfer with the core-periphery concept of development as expounded by Immanual Wallerstein under the title of 'The Modern World-System.' A study of the literature on international development seemed to indicate that Wallerstein's approach might provide a framework into which my work on the peripheral regions of Europe could fit.

The desire to get to grips with the task of building up a picture of the educational context lead me back to Davie's work. This was to be the starting point of the whole project. However my reading around the subject of development and the start of the investigation of the Scottish case failed to clarify the links between the two areas of interest. As the material on Scotland became more familiar it seemed more obvious that the theoretical and the practical tasks were more tenuously connected than I had imagined. In particular I came to realize that Wallerstein's framework did not provide an operatable modus operandi for the researcher on educational affairs. I came to appreciate that my preoccupation with the need to address the wider

theoretical debate was in conflict with the more practical task of getting to grips with the material on Scotland. Wallerstein's work failed to provide a context for looking at the cultural and social aspects that were of central importance in the area under consideration.

As a result of these realizations it was decided to concentrate solely on the Scottish and English material with the hope that a firmly based study might lead to a well-founded analysis that would address the theoretical points that I had originally been interested in. By limiting the work to the more manageable scale of the study of the universities in these two parts of Britain I hope to be able to look at a small number of institutions in detail which, nevertheless, had a disproportonate impact on the development of educational ideas in their respective regions.

The appreciation that the study of the macro-scale needed to be informed by the consideration of the micro-scale was confirmed by Nigel Grant's comments on the possibility of linking the study of education in Britain with the wider subject of the international exchange of educational ideas. As Grant says in his article on 'The British Isles as an Area of Study in Comparative Education'

> 'In this group of islands on the edge of Europe . . . we have a potentially rich field for the study in microcosm of problems with a much wider application. In a world where it is less and less possible for educational systems, however legally independent, to operate in cultural isolation, where people will have to be equipped to be (say) Highland and Scots and British and European and, of course, citizens of the wider community, we need all the experience and ideas we can get. These islands could be a workshop for the study of cultural and educational pluralism, its

> constraints, problems and potential, and of the power and limitations of the old unitary model.' [1]

One of the points that seemed worth examining was the way in which the case of Scotland might provide some interesting evidence about the assumption that in the relations between nations that the economically dominant countries tended to be culturally dominant.

Methodology

A lengthy consideration of the secondary sources on the Scottish university tradition reinforced the impression that G.E. Davie's work was the outstanding piece. And so at the outset of this study I followed up and checked the material referred to by that author. This involved looking up the reports of the Royal Commissions and Executive Commissions referred to and the study of the contemporary pamphlets quoted in 'The Democratic Intellect.'

I also made contact with some of the individuals who had written on the subject of the nineteenth century universities or who had published reviews or critiques of Davie's work. A crucial step in the development of this thesis arose out of this stage of work. At a meeting with Andrew MacPherson I saw some notes made on an address he had attended in March 1974 that was given by Donald Withrington under the title 'The Scottish Universities Commission of 1826-30'. Withrington had clearly offered a stimulating critique of the interpretation of events provided by Davie. According to those notes Withrington differed from Davie in that he wished to see the events of 1825 and 1826 as part of a context that took notice of the events taking place in the political milieu of Westminster. From the notes one could see that Withrington had dug into Robert Peel's correspondence at the British Museum for the period in question to see if Peel had made any comments on the reasons behind his decision as Home Secretary to call the 1826 Royal Commission.

On reading these notes on Withrington's address it became clear that there was the potential to extend this methodology to investigate the other events discussed by Davie in 'The Democratic Intellect' and that as a consequence an original piece of research on hitherto unpublished material could be pursued. Various efforts to discuss this

course of action with Withrington seemed doomed to failure and so I proceeded to get on with the spade work.

Secondary sources provided a list of the main characters involved in the nineteenth century reform of the Scottish and English universities and by then tracing the correspondence between these individuals at the critical periods under investigation I was able to come up with various statements about the reasons for the reforms. By referring to the records of the National Registry of Archives in London I found that it was possible to locate the correspondence of individuals scattered in a number of libraries throughout Britain. I also found that some of the people involved in the reforms seemed to have left little or no correspondence. On the positive side, for example, I established that Robert Peel was in correspondence with the Lord Advocate of Scotland, William Rae, and that the Registry of Archives indicated that some of the original letters written by Rae to Peel were deposited amongst the Home Office Papers at the Public Records Office at Kew. In this way it was possible to view and note both ends of the correspondence about the setting up of the 1826 Royal Commission on the Scottish universities.

A similar procedure was adopted with regard to the other main events which form the focus of this thesis. In this way the letters written by a diverse number of people are used in order to throw some light on the happenings being studied. Once one had given due consideration to the context and purposes of these letters it seemed possible to conclude that these private and confidential exchanges may be more illuminating than other, more public, pronouncements.

However the more public pronouncements must be seen as another valued primary source. Pamphlets, newspaper reports, newspaper leading articles, essays and addresses were all used by key persons as a way to further their own ends. Even evidence given to the various Commissions contain relevent declarations about the universities.

In dealing with the private and public records of the opinions and views of those persons at the centre of the debates over the various reforms we will need to give careful consideration to the relationship between the ideas expressed in those records and the more general background and interests of the writer or speaker. This necessitates the development of some understanding of where the writer or speaker fits into the economic, social and political context of their times. The study of such reference works as the Dictionary of National Biography, Who's Who, Who's Who of British Members of Parliament together with the reading of all relevent autobiographies and biographies helped to develop some grasp of the situation in which these writers and speakers were making their pronouncements.

So in addition to relating the reform of the Scottish and English universities to other aspects of the social and economic history of the nineteenth century it seemed that there was a further need to relate the words of the main actors involved to their own biographies. This procedure seemed particularly appropriate in dealing with the question of the nature of the various Commissions appointed by the government to enquire into and execute reforms in the English and Scottish universities. As we will see some assumptions about the composition of those Commissions can be put to the test by collecting detailed information about the backgrounds of the Commissioners.

Only after pursuing this policy for some time did I come across Shapin and Thackray's paper on 'Prosopography as a Research Tool in History of Science' in which they describe 'collective biography' as developing into a 'sophisticated tool for establishing links between action and context.'[2] This was just the purpose that was required in this thesis. Lawrence Stone's paper on this technique explains how he sees that this approach may be used in

'uncovering the deeper interests that are thought to be

beneath the rhetoric of politics.'[3]

Now whether or not the limited use of biography employed in this work can hope to produce such relevations or whether it merely assists in the development of a fuller understanding of the context of action is open to question. It is at least of some interest that one of the techniques employed in this study is a recognized research technique. However it seems unlikely that an understanding of the complex changes wrought in the universities can arise out of the study of the words and biographies of a variety of individuals. Rather I an inclined to proceed on the basis that some general hypothesis about the relationships between these individuals is required.

Having referred to the desirability of stating a hypothesis at an early stage we might turn now to note a possible criticism of Davie's book. His ideas on the 'anglicization' of the Scottish universities is put forward without providing any evidence as to the nature of the education in the English universities. If we wish to connect the history of the Scottish universities in the nineteenth century with the more general question of educational transfer we will have to look very closely at the history of the English universities in that century. In particular it seems desirable to focus on events on both sides of the border in order to see if the Scots were being treated any differently from the new university institutions in England. Hence the chapter that concentrates on the events surrounding the Royal Commission on the Scottish universities in 1826 also examines the developments connected with the establishment of the University of London in the 1820s and 1830s; the mid-century Commission on the Scottish universities is set against the background of the reform of the recruitment procedures of the Indian Civil Service and the enquires into the two ancient English universities; the 1870s Commission on the four northern institutions is juxtaposed against the establishment of the civic universities

and the 1889 Commission is considered in the light of the financial support given by the government to universities on both sides of the border.

The intention of this apposition of Scottish and English events is to reveal whether or not the transfer of ideas was on the basis of educational criteria or other factors. Davie seems to imply that the latter is the case. So while I accept that Davie's ideas about the 'three attacks' on the Scottish universities has influenced the shape and scope of this thesis other questions raised by Davie will be subjected to close analysis.

In the course of this thesis Davie's proposition about the causes of university reform in Scotland increasingly appeared to be too simple an idea. In these circumstances it seems incumbent on this work to come up with an alternative formulation that offers a better prospect of conceptualizing the developments of the last century. As we will see later Davie's book posits the idea that Scotland preserved its own 'social ethic' into the nineteenth century and that 'unification in politics, separation in ethics' aptly described the nature of the relationship between England and Scotland at the opening of the period being studied. In the Introduction to his book the author makes the point that

> 'education became the chief forum of resistence to Southern encroachment, and provided a rallying-point for national principle.'[4]

Now Davie's linking of educational issues with non-educational factors is extremely valuable, but ultimately his analysis begins to appear partial. While 'The Democratic Intellect' is valuable in that it draws attention to the cultural dimension of the educational context there is a need for an approach which allows for social, economic and educational factors to be related to each other. A step

in the right direction is provided in Randall Collin's article on 'some comparative principles of educational stratification' in which he tries to work towards a 'theory of cultural markets.' Collins describes how a great many interests in education may 'have conflicted, but nevertheless collectively resulted in a larger system of educational stratification.' He goes on to suggest that this system

> 'is a market for cultural goods in which various sources of demand mesh with sources of supply.'

Collins identifies three types of education - 'training in practical skills', 'education in the leisure culture of a status group' and 'highly formal educational systems.' The value of the approach suggested by Collins to this study consists of his linking of these demands with the actions of 'social actors.' He says

> 'The various kinds of demand for education . . . may be viewed more broadly as part of a <u>cultural market</u> in which social actors simultaneously attempt to attain certain goals.'

Now, this perspective seemed to hold possibilities, but it was not explicit enough to provide a ready-made typology for the situation being studied in this thesis. The general idea put forward by Collins started a train of thought which was encouraged by the notion, suggested by Collins, that

> 'The differences among the main types of educational structures in the modern world can be explained by differences among the lineups of contending interests.'[5]

Although this author returned to the idea of 'cultural markets' in his book on 'The Credential Society' the notion was not developed in a way that assists this study; rather Collins provides a non-comparative

study of the historical development of educational stratification in the United States and with exploring the nature of the 'sinecure society' than in taking the idea of cultural markets further. However, in 'The Credential Society' Collins does make the point that

> 'Persons with common cultural resources tend to form egalitarian ties with friends or co-members of a group. Such groups are . . . major actors within the struggles to control organizations, whether over work pace, gatekeeping criteria, the definition of possible duties and perquisites, assessment of merit or personal advancement.'[5a]

In so far as providing a typology for this work this still falls short, but the general direction of Collins work and his desire to develop a Weberian perspective encouraged me to think in terms of looking at the reform of the universities in terms of the inputs of identified social and cultural groups.

While Collins goes on to concentrate on the connections between the contending interests groups and the occupational structure I will aim to develop a more abstract typology that arises out of the context being studied.

As a starting point for the further description of those groups we can refer to a recent article by Ronald King on Weberian perspectives and the study of education in which he points out that

> 'Weber saw the changes in education in his own time in terms of a struggle between two images of the prophets of education: the cultivated man and the specialist man.'[6]

Weber never produced a clear explicit theory on educational matters and so an understanding of what we might call a Weberian approach to the subject has to be constructed out of his writings on a variety of topics. For example, to seek an elaboration of the simple typology outlined above we have to refer to Weber's work on bureaucracy. There he says

> 'Expressed in slogan-like fashion, the 'cultivated man' rather than the 'specialist', has been the end sought by education and has formed the basis of social esteem in such various systems as the feudal, theocratic and patrimonial structures of domination: in the English notable administration, in the old Chinese patrimonial bureaucracy, as well as under the rule of demagogues in the so-called Hellenic democracy.'[7]

As Weber implies in his opening phrase the division of the cultivated man from the specialist man is hardly sufficient as a basis for the analysis of the development of university education. This two-fold typology may serve some general purpose in the discussion of education or in the presentation of philosophical differences, but it does not provide a sufficiently differentiated model for the study of the groups which will form the main focus of this thesis. As I will explain in the next section, my reading of the material on the Scottish and English universities led me to conclude that three identifiable groups had an impact on university affairs in the nineteenth century. And so I rejected the Weberian typology as a basis for this study. Clearly others may judge otherwise. In their paper on 'Universities and Academic Systems on Modern Societies', for example, Ben-David and Zloczower maintain that

> 'The modern English university arose, therefore, out of two traditions: aristocratic elite education designed to mould the character and impart a peculiar way of life on the one hand, and utilitarian training and teaching for

professional and industrial middle class careers on the other hand.'[8]

Whilst Ben-David and Zloczower make some interesting observations about the English universities and the higher education of the "classes" their interpretation of the historical record appears to be superifical. By indiscriminately moving between the terms 'English' and 'British' these authors end up by overlooking some of the significant differences between the university systems on either side of the Tweed. In particular we may observe that their imprecision has lead them to underestimate the gap between those universities which aimed to provide a preparation for those entering the learned professions from those universities which concentrated on the education of those training to work in industry or commerce.

In this thesis we will need to give particular attention to differentiating the practices and traditions in the Scottish universities from the practices and ideas introduced in the emergent 'civic universities' opened in the second half of the nineteenth century. When Ben-David and Zloczower conflate all forms of non-liberal education under the umbrella heading of 'utilitarian education' they lose sight of some of the most interesting and important aspects of the struggle over the universities in the last century. In this work I wish to show that a two-fold typology is too narrow in that it leads to the development of a perspective in which Oxford and Cambridge are on one side of the divide and the 'rest' of the universities in England and Scotland are lumped together under the misleading and unhelpful heading of 'provincial universities.'

However, the general approach of relating the changes in education to the struggles between the different groups has been adopted. From the preliminary study of the nineteenth century universities it was apparent that we would need to take into account the differences between the professional and mercantile wings of the middle class and so while the general approach was useful this work would have to draw distinctions amongst the 'specialists.'

The Frame of Reference

As I have previously indicated my reading of the primary and secondary sources on the nineteenth century Scottish and English universities led me to identify three groups which took part in the debates over reform. In this section of the thesis I will set out the nature of the linkage between the ideas about university reform and the thinking associated with the aristocracy, the professions and the mercantile wing of the middle class.

A most clear and strong association can be identified in the link between the aristocratic notion of 'liberal education' and the practices at Oxbridge in the opening years of the last century. The two ancient English universities aimed to provide the sort of education that was deemed to be suited for a 'gentleman.' Originally the type of education associated with the aristocracy catered solely for that small class, but gradually it provided the model for the landed gentry and the clergy of the Church of England. This link formed part of the 'rise in the gentry' in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century that is well documented, even if Tawney's description of it as a 'bourgeois revolution' is disputed by Trevor-Roper. Hexter expresses the opinion that

> 'the tendency of the owners of lesser landed properties in England to gravitate into the political orbit of the greater landed proprietors is beyond doubt.'[9]

Although Hexter's comments about the dispute between Tawney and Trevor-Roper do not fully resolve the matter we can observe that in educational matters at least the link was between the gentry and aristocracy rather than between the gentry and the mercantile section of the middle class. The attraction of the aristocratic idea was social. At Oxbridge the traditional educational practices were strongly

associated with the development of the attributes of a 'gentleman'. In his study of the ideal of a liberal education at Cambridge in the years 1800 to 1850 Garland indicates that

> 'Social distinctions were sharp and taken seriously. Members of the upper class could enter college as noblemen or "Fellow Commoners". Distinguished by special caps and robes, they were granted many privileges, including eating at high table, sharing the Fellows' Common Room, and - in the case of the nobility - graduating without taking examinations.'[10]

Although there seems to be some dispute as to the numbers of aristocrats studying at Oxbridge in the eighteenth century there seems to be some agreement that their influence was significant. Cannon considers the evidence and concludes that

> 'The aristocratic influence in university life was probably greater than at any other period.'[11]

Sheldon Rothblatt also notes the connections between the ideas of the aristocratic class and the concept of liberal education. In his book on 'Tradition and Change in English Liberal Education' he traces the historical links between the Georgian concept of that idea and the formulations of liberal education that existed in the nineteenth century. Rothblatt believes that one of the central tenets of both formulations was that

> 'the theory of liberal education, being a theory of character formation, stresses the education of the whole man.'[12]

Further on in that same work Rothblatt makes the important point that liberal education was seen as an end in itself rather than as a means to a further end. In this way he suggests that

> 'A liberal education . . . was a matter of mind-training. The value of a particular subject or discipline lay in the number of faculties it could cultivate, so that classical languages could be said to stimulate the logical faculties, and especially the faculty of memory, classical poetry the imaginative ones, classical rhetoric the moral faculties and so on.'[13]

The gentlemanly ideals of the aristocratic students provided the tone of 'liberal education' at Oxford and Cambridge. Even those students anticipating a career in the Church were expected to study either Euclidian mathematics, if at Cambridge, or the two 'dead' languages of Latin and Greek, if at Oxford. And so, as Rothblatt points out, the English parson

> 'was unquestionably a gentleman, on equal or near equal terms with the Squire of the neighbourhood, to who, in fact, he might be related; and despite his income, which may have been barely adequate to his needs, undoubtedly superior in status to tradesmen, merchants and the professional men of the country towns.'[14]

The idea of liberal education was embraced by those groups which could benefit from the social cachet associated with the notion of a 'gentleman'. In practice a mutally beneficial bond was forged between the English clergy, the gentry and the aristocracy.

In his work on 'English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century' F.M.C. Thompson suggests that the English aristocracy was 'only another word for the greater owners of land.'[15] Historians of the nineteenth century seem to vary in their interpretation of the power and influence of the aristocracy. Clearly the matters being studied in this thesis are closely linked with that question; in the later part of this work further consideration will have to be given to

this question. At this point we may take some guidance from one of the more widely quoted interpretations of this period. In his study of 'the making of Victorian England' Kitson Clark offers the opinion that

> 'In the middle of the nineteenth century . . . the political system was still to a reasonable extent the plaything of the nobility and the gentry, and in particular of the hereditary owners of the great estates.'[16]

Kitson Clark contrasts the 'old style' nobility and gentry with the 'new style'. He points out that considerable fortunes were being made in commerce and industry, but that

> 'in many cases the owners of them had consolidated their position economically and socially by buying estates, so that as the century went forward among the landed propietors could be found the Peels, the Arkwrights, the Barings, the Strutts and other families who had made their fortunes before they brought their land.'[17]

Working with the agriculturally-based 'old style' aristocracy in the first half of the last century were the country gentry. In rural areas the main force of government power was disseminated through this class; the local squire exercised his influence as a result of his position as landlord and often through his post as local magistrate. Together with the local parson these two set the tone for rural politics. As the century progressed the gentry, along with the aristocracy, developed non-agricultural sources of income which helped them in prolonging their influence onto the second half of the century.

The repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 should not be seen as the end of the fortunes of agriculture and, therefore, as the end of the power

of the nobility and gentry. If anything the mid-point of the century saw the beginning of the end of the 'old style' nobility and gentry, but not its complete submission. Kitson Clark suggests that it was not until 1867 and the Second Reform Bill that saw 'the old regime begin to break.'[18]

In its place arose a 'new gentry' and politics which had a much broader base that included urban-based groups that had hitherto quite distinct origins from those in the upper echelons of society. This extension lead to, and still presents, definitional difficulties that were, and still are, close to being circular in nature. It was clear that one of the significant reference points for the old aristocracy and gentry had been that one was born into that class and, therefore, social positions were ascribed. But as the old aristocracy and gentry sought to extend their influence over urban-based groups their ideas became less distinct. The main defining characteristic was increasingly centred on the notion of a 'gentleman'. The problem arose in defining a gentleman if one could not confine it to a matter of birth. Kitson Clark states the problem in this way

> 'some tests were needed which would extend the number of gentlemen, and which would rationalize and moralize the conception of a gentleman for a generation which the old naive touchstones of blood, or heraldry, or landownership would by no means suffice.
>
> One obvious test that came to be of increasing importance was the test of education.'[19]

And so we arrive at the position by the second half of the century where a 'gentleman' comes to be defined on the basis of his receiving a liberal education and a liberal education comes to be defined on the basis of its value as a means of separating 'gentlemen' from the rest.

The essential point to note is that a 'gentlemans' education was,

by definition, an education which served no practical purpose other than to fit him with his peers. The very fact that it was not related to the utilitarian requirements of the individual was important and in this respect the study of the 'dead' languages and of Euclidian mathematics was eminently justifiable.

However not everybody subscribed to the educational model assumed under this version of liberal education. In particular the Scots had pursued a concept of education which embodied their own, philosophically-based, notion of what constituted a liberal education. In this version utility was not excluded. The Scots had a tradition of using the universities as training centres for those entering the professions. Over a number of decades the universities of Scotland had extended their curriculum to attract students wishing to study as a prelude to practice in one of the three learned professions- law, medicine and the church.

In his chapter on the universities in 'Scottish Democracy' Saunders indicates that at the beginning of the last century the international reputation of the Scottish universities was higher than their English counterparts mainly due to the strength of their professional education. The four year arts course which preceded the specialist studies provided a liberal education based on the study of philosophy. Latin was taught with 'a professional bent as preparing for medicine, law or theology', according to Saunders and the teaching of Greek he describes as 'inferior.' Yet Saunders insists that such a comparison between the teaching in the English and Scottish universities is unfair in that

> 'Scottish academics expounded another tradition of learning with its own preoccupations and achievements. An enthusiasm for education was here more conspicuous. It was inspired by strong professional ambition among the students and supported by widespread popular interest in and respect for academic opportunity and distinction.'[20]

In the eighteenth century when those in the two universities of England were content to follow the examples of their predecessors the professors of the Scottish universities were reforming along with the times so as to maintain their incomes by keeping up the student numbers in their classes. As we will see in a later section the two Lowland universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow were the first to respond to the social and economic changes taking place in Scottish society. They came to reaffirm the practice of training lawyers - now the law students would enter a secular profession rather than the ecclesiastical legal practices of their medieval predecessors.

In his consideration of the culture and society of early nineteenth century Edinburgh Phillipson suggests that 'the city had lost its aristocratic society' and that the 'new dominant elite' were the legal profession and 'especially the bar.'[21] Elsewhere this author contends that previously the Lowland universities had

> 'become increasingly responsive to the educational needs of a civic-minded gentry and professional class.'[22]

The Scottish legal profession set the tone of life north of the border. This elite was quite autonomous and independent from the legal circles in London. In Scotland they practiced a form of Roman law of ancient origin whilst the English legal system had developed a Canon law system at the time of the argument between Henry VIII and the Pope. The two Edinburgh-based branches of the legal profession (the Faculty of Advocates and the Writers of the Signet) retained a complete independence from their English counterparts. These professional associations kept a keen eye on the education in the Scottish universities as those institutions played a central role in the training of entrants to the profession.

The differences between the Scottish church and the Church of England were just as well-established and fundamental as the legal divisions between England and Scotland just mentioned. The Reformation

had seen the development of separate and autonomous churchs with ideologically distinct internal structures. The Church of England was a more hierarchical system in which the bishops played a central role while in the Church of Scotland a structure was developed in which the local presbytery was a power sourse that was much closer to the grass-roots. These contrasting traditions had an impact on the place of the cleric in each society. In the south the parson was closely connected with the aristocratic class whereas in Scotland the minister was more closely identified as a member of the professional class. As Anderson notes

> 'The Presbyterian ministry offered a few lucrative livings and no posts above the parish level, and consequently did not attract the upper classes as the Church of England did.'[23]

As we have already noted Rothblatt describes the English parson was being 'unquestionably a gentleman' who was quite unlike the typical minister found in Scotland. While in the north the clerics were recruited from the ranks of the middle classes in England the younger sons of aristocratic families tended to set the tone for the parsons of the Church of England and the opportunities for the livings in parishes were often in the gift of powerful bishops who may have been influenced by relatives and friends.

The links between the Church of Scotland and the universities had survived from medieval times. The education provided by those institutions reflected the more democratic nature of the church in the north. So rather than receive an English liberal education as set down by the universities of Oxford and Cambridge the Scottish minister received an education that was touched by the 'enlightenment' and reflected an interest in learning that was absent in the English universities.

With regard to the third learned profession, the medical men, we

must note that the practices and controls over this profession were influenced by the happenings in England. The medical graduates of the universities of Scotland were destined to enter a competitive job market that went beyond the borders of Scotland, and even beyond the shores of Britain. Scottish-trained doctors could be found in many out-posts of the British Empire.

Although the job market extended beyond the Scottish border the practices and education found at the universities were unlike the medical education found elsewhere. At Edinburgh, in particular, the medical faculty grew in the course of the eighteenth century into a centre of international repute. The fact that the training of doctors took place within a university environment effected both those institutions and the nature of medical education. The universities took more naturally to the development of 'new' subjects such as chemistry and biology while at the same time the philosophical emphasis of all studies in the Scottish universities lead to a closer interpenetration of those subjects with other forms of study.

In this way the Scottish medical professions developed in a way that was very different from the English medical professions which were based at the London hospitals. In particular we should note that the changing prestige of the medical profession in the nineteenth century may be seen to be associated with the strengthening of the links between the universities and the medical schools. The fact that nearly all students completed an 'arts' course as a preliminary to their strictly professional studies was a particularly Scottish idea. Although we may suspect that Cant tends to overstate the case there is some value in his comments that

> 'the broad scope and philosophical emphasis of the traditional arts curriculum and the fact that it was a necessary preliminary to the study in the professional faculties of medicine, law and divinity was in itself of immense cultural value . . . Scottish professional

> men were accustomed to think in philosophical terms which infused their work with a more elevated scale of values and gave to their activities and those of their academic colleagues an underlying unity.'[24]

Now this emphasis on professional education in the Scottish universities was something that clearly distinguished them from their aristocratically associated counterparts at Oxford and Cambridge. And yet our analysis and preliminary comments cannot stop there for we still have to consider the links between the universities and the mercantile and commercial classes who began to play an increasingly important role in university affairs as the century progressed.

As I have already intimated I believe it is a mistake to lump together all forms of non-liberal education under the umbrella title of 'utilitarian education'. When discussing the development of university education in Britain in the last century I think it is necessary to distinguish professional education from the education provided for those working to enter industry or commerce.

In this way we may observe that the Scottish universities were indeed, as Davie maintains, more 'democratic' in their intake than Oxbridge, but that they still retained a distinction between professional and commercial or technical education by preserving a bias in favour of the former. In his article on Scotland and her universities in the eighteenth century Withrington makes the point that

> 'Since these universities mainly prepared their students for the learned professions, the education at them 'must from its nature be tedious and expensive and ill-suited to the circumstances of the great bulk of people in a commercial country.'[25]

So the notion of 'utilitarian education' must be regarded as

something distinct from both liberal education and professional education. It should be distinguished from liberal education as the idea of 'useful' knowledge was anathema to the supporters of liberal education. In fact we can go so far as to indicate that a central tenet of liberal education was that it was not useful. In this way the unworldliness of the 'gentlemen' produced by Oxford and Cambridge was an indication of their gentlemanliness.

Similarly, but to a far lesser extent, there was a social dimension involved in the education of those preparing to enter the three learned professions. At an early stage in the nineteenth century we may observe that the professional associations sought to limit entry into the ranks of the professions in order to increase the prestige of those already licenced to practice. The status of the professions was steadily improved as the century progressed.

So although I have so far made an attempt to draw distinctions between liberal education and professional education we must admit that, in practice, some common ground existed. It must be acknowledged that certain professional studies could be undertaken at Oxford and Cambridge and that the Scottish did make limited concessions to the sort of high-status studies provided for those wishing to see those institutions emulate the social prestige of the two southern places.

In making this point it seems aposit to consider that although this thesis will juxtapose 'English' with 'Scottish' this does not imply an significant geographical features in the determination of the type of education in the two university systems. The point is rather that while social and cultural differences can be seen to coincide with the political division of Britain those political divisions do not provide an adequate basis for the sort of analysis being attempted here. Rather the reference to 'Scottish' ideas or 'English' ideas represents a convenient shorthand for differences that are much more complex than those labels imply.

The inadequacy of 'English' versus 'Scottish' ideas as a basis for analysis becomes particularly obvious when we come to look at the notions of those from the mercantile sector of society who were interested in something that was neither 'liberal' nor 'professional' education. In this thesis I hope to show that isolated local campaigns for the extension of university education into new areas of study developed into a movement of such importance that any study of the nineteenth century universities cannot ignore it. In his work on the links between the universities and British industry Sanderson notes that 'civic universites' were founded in many of the major industrial cities in Britain in the second half of the last century. He indicates that those foundations were often associated with the initiatives of local business men and industrialists. He says

> 'The vitality of the English civic universities movement thus owed much to its intimate connections and interrelations with industry. In Manchester, Birmingham and Liverpool the generosity of the business community to their universities was amply repaid by the work of the colleges. In Leeds, Newcastle, Sheffield and above all in London, where the universities were not supported as they ought to have been the value of the colleges to industry far outweighed what they received from it.'[26]

Green refers to the nature of the links between the universities and industry in his book on the universities; he reflections on the university curriculum contain the note that

> 'the milieu in which the newer universities came to maturity was largely responsible for the stress on scientific studies and on their practical application to industry.'[27]

After the poor showing of the British exhibitors at the Paris Exhibition of 1867 the local initiatives developed into a national campaign. Within the next few years the government had appointed both a Select Committee (under the chairmanship of Samuelson) and a Royal Commission (known as the Devonshire Commission) to look into the nature of the connections between industrial performance in the international market and the provision of education. The mercantile section of the middle class' viewpoint became more credible as those ideas came to be more closely associated with the furtherance of the 'national interest.'

The fact that Sanderson talks of the 'English civic universities' is slightly inexact in so far as Dundee must be counted as a civic university. At this point we should note that there was a difference in the response in the north from that in the south and that this will form an interesting aspect of the central analysis in this thesis.

The methodology outlined in this introduction does present certain problems. The linking of the specific reforms at certain times in certain places with the wider scale developments by reference to the aristocracy, the professions and the mercantile class does produce a unity which might otherwise be lacking. However, we must face the fact that one of the more intractable difficulties is that in relating educational ideas with certain groups within society it is almost impossible to avoid the tautological position of defining educational ideas by reference to characteristics of the supporting group and of defining that supporting group by reference to educational criteria. It can be seen that educational criteria form a significant part of the dialogue which serves to separate one group from another. Each of the three groups identified in this work used their ideas on educational matters as weapons to be turned against their adversaries. In his discussion of the rise of the 'credential system' in the U.S.A. Randall Collins refers to this aspect of the educational context and relates it to the nature of the relationships between economically

defined classes and other cultural groups. He says

> 'Economic classes do not exist in one compartment, cultural groups in another. Empirically, the world consists of the interaction of individuals manoeuvring individually for whatever goods and favourable social position they can obtain. Not only are cultural goods weapons that individuals can use in obtaining and monopolizing economic positions, but cultural goods also make all the difference in determining how individuals will ally with others in order to fight for advantage.'[28]

The connection between educational differences and other differences is two way and so neither can be taken as a constant. In his work on 'Education and Society in Modern Europe' Ringer comments on the way in which educational forms may be used to reinforce social distinctions. His example is an indication that the process being described is a two-way interaction and that neither side of the interaction can be divorced from the other side. He says

> 'in 1879 German civil engineers protested against the proposal that graduates of nonclassical secondary school should, after completing advanced studies, be admitted to their branch of the civil service. They were afraid that the standing of their profession would be lowered if Latin were dropped as a prerequisite. Here is an instance in which the utility of Latin in occupational practice was not seriously alleged. The status of a curriculum defined the status of a profession rather than the other way around.[29]

The nineteenth century was a period of great change and in studying events that cover the whole of the century we have to be sensitive to the fact that the terms and terminology we use may not refer to phenomena that were constant. The definition of such terms as 'university','aristocracy', 'profession' and 'scientist'

can only be related to the time in which they were used. This is an unavoidable problem. For example, the term 'scientist' only came into common usage in the later half of the last century, but there were clearly incursions of related terms at the opening of the century.

Before moving on to the next section one further comment needs to be made about the consideration of the historical material used in this work. Having indicated that this thesis will set out to examine the links between the ideas of three identified interest groups and the changes taking place in the universities we should not assume that any of those groups were ever in a position to impose their ideas in an overt or functional manner. In their introduction to a comparative study of education in France and England in the last century Vaughan and Archer deal with this point when they refer to the theories of structural-functionalists. These two authors comment on the way that those theorists attempt to establish functional links between the dominent social roles in a society and the educational practices in that society. Vaughan and Archer refer to the way in which theorists such as Ralph Turner, in his paper on sponsored and contest mobility, is most explicit about what he calls 'an organizing folk norm.' Whilst acknowledging the plurality of norms in any society Turner assumes the ascendency of one set of norms is continuous. In discussing the notion of sponsored mobility Vaughan and Archer indicate that

> 'the fact that it was in the interests of the educationally dominent group to propagate the tenet that education and leadership were the prerogatives of the well-born does not confirm the existence of such a folk norm.'

A consequence of the approach of the structural-functionalists is that they tend to discount the actions of groups or individuals unless they coincide with the expression of 'social needs.' Vaughan and Archer further contend that these theories (they mention M.D. Shipman's work on 'Sociology of the School') have difficulty in accounting for the diversity of educational development in Europe.

Vaughan and Archer contend that the sort of testible proposition of educational adaption put forward by structural-functionalists cannot explain the fact that

> 'A comparison of England and France in either 1800 or1850, employing a multiplicity of indices . . .shows England to have been the outstanding leader in industrialization. Contrary to the prediction, however, it is France whose educational institutions bear the characteristics attributed to industrial society - specialized training for the professions and administration, social mobility through school achievement, a rationalistic educational philosophy and an incorporation of recent scientific developments in there curricula.'

Vaughan and Archer make a strong case that although structural-functionalists may be able to explain away the British experience by reference to the notion of 'delayed adaption' they must still account for the French case where,they maintain, structural-functionalists

> 'are logically incapable of explaining the industrial 'pre-adaption' of French educational institutions.'[30]

The nature of the relationship between the reform of the universities and the educational ideas associated with the aristocracy, the professions and the mercantile wing of the middle class seem to be a much more subtle link than system theorists appear to acknowledge.

This is leading beyond the scope of this chapter. The aim of this work is to perform the task of establishing whether or not the study of university reform of nineteenth century Scotland and England can be understood in a context which takes account of social and cultural, as well as purely educational, factors. We must wait to the end of this work to see if the approach outlined here will prove to be internally coherent enough for us to achieve any insights into the educational context of Scotland and England in the last century.

Relationship to existing Research

In the extensive literature on the universities of Scotland and England in the nineteenth century there appears to be no work that sets out to offer a comparative analysis of the two systems. Quite a few works touch on parts of the story, but without addressing the comparison directly. So, for this study the most important piece of existing research has been George Davie's book on 'The Democratic Intellect.' Davie first drew my attention to the historical differences between the two university systems and laid the foundations for understanding that non-educational criteria were of importance in studying the development of educational institutions.

In the forward to his study Davie tells us that whilst collecting material for a doctoral thesis on the 'Scottish school of common sense philosophy' he became so absorbed in 'the story behind the story' that he launched into quite a different book on 'the rise and fall of the Scottish universities, or, to be precise, of that central sector of them, known as the Arts Faculty.'[31] One of the strengths of 'The Democratic Intellect' is that the study of the universities is placed in a wider context. As Davie indicates the paradox of Scottish history even after the Union of the parliaments in 1707 was that 'unity in politics combined with a diversity in what may be called social ethics.' Davie relates this general point to the educational context when he notes that

> 'The principal of centralization was confined to the Parliamentary and fiscal spheres and local automony remained intact not only in the church but also in the judicature and, what is equally important, in cetain fundamental institutions in which legal and clerical interests met, such as, above all, the educational system.'[32]

According to Davie's thesis the 'continued foreignness of the Scottish ethos' to the English was most clearly apparent in

> 'the educational system which, combining the democracy of the Kirk-elders with the intellectualism of the advocate, made expertise in metaphysics the condition of the open door of social advancement.' [33]

Davie's ambition in writing 'The Democratic Intellect' was to produce an interpretation of Scottish history that sees the distinctive life of the country in terms of the 'mutual interaction of religion, law and education.' [34]

In practice this leads Davie in treating in a series of essays the question of the place of the universities in the nineteenth century from three points of view; namely

> 'first their resistance to anglicization, second their efforts to cope with modern specialising tendencies, mathematical, scientific and classical, and third their involvement in the central church-state struggle.' [35]

'The Democratic Intellect' is divided into four parts of varying lengths. In the opening section Davie deals with 'University Politics' before moving on to cover 'The Crisis in Science'. The third part concentrates on 'The Crisis in Classics' while the closing part looks at 'Ferrier and Common Sense.' Although all four quarters are interrelated the nature of this thesis will lead us to concentrate more on the opening one hundred pages that deal with 'University Politics' than on the last three sections.

The first chapter of the opening section consists of an essay on 'The Presbyterian Inheritance' in which the author emphasises the point that since the Union of England and Scotland the Scots had

> 'retained the right to follow their national usage in religion, law and education.'

Davie maintains that educational differences between England and Scotland were particularly important in the century after the Union because

> 'the educational system of Scotland became more and more unlike that of England, at the very time when, in other respects, the country was becoming increasingly anglicized.' [36]

However this author does suggest that 'under the impact of nineteenth century politico-economic developments' by 1830 a severe crisis had arisen on the question of 'how far the universities were to subordinate themselves to the Southern system.' The author indicates that a sixty-years-long struggle occured which resulted in the Scots having to 'admit the educational predominance of England.' According to Davie the significance of this struggle, for the Scots at least, centred on the educational systems place as the 'chief forum of resistence to Southern encroachment, and provided a rallying-point for national principle.' [37]

In Davie's view the 'issued constantly returned to the question of the relationship of school to University.' It was widely argued that one of the distinctive features of the universities of Scotland in the early part of the nineteenth century was that they accepted students at a young age, maybe at sixteen, and put them through a philosophically orientated arts course as a preliminary, for the better ones, to the specialist or professional training which started at the age of twenty or thereabouts. In Davie's words

> 'the object of the struggle was to decide whether it was the duty of the universities to round off the general education began at school, by putting the student

> through a stiff course in philosophy . . . or whether the general education was not to include philosophy, and was, in any case, to be completed before the student left school.' [38]

George Davie's next comments formed an influential backbone of the shape and scope of this thesis on the nineteenth century scene. He suggests that

> 'In this dour struggle . . . three successive phases can be discussed. The first of these found expression in the Report of the first Universities Commission (1826-30) . . . The second phase of the crisis occured in the fifties . . . the third phase of the crisis opened with the report of the 1878 Commission . . . ' [39]

These three phases have determined the form of my thesis. The events of the 1820s and 1830s have been treated in one chapter; the happenings of the 1850s in another and the reforms between 1876 and 1889 in the penultimate chapter. Against these Scottish events have been set the English context.

Throughout his discussion of these 'attacks' on the Scottish tradition Davie identifies different groups by such labels as 'traditionalist Scots', 'a group of influential Scots who wished to impose Southern standards', 'the Scottish admirers of English educational standards', 'anglicizing factions' and 'the anglophil party.' My desire to set the Scottish events against the English context is consequent upon the doubts that arise about the value of the categories Davie uses in his discussion of the groups involved in the reforms.

After an outline of the plan of the first part of his book the author uses the rest of that chapter on 'the presbyterian inheritance' to discuss George Jardine, the professor of Logic in

Glasgow up to 1827 as the exemplifier of the 'Scottish academic tradition'. Davie calls Jardine 'one of the most significant figures' in that tradition and insists that he was respected throughout the land as an influential link in the great chain of national educators. This author refers to Jardine's book on the 'Outlines of a Philosophical Education' and concludes that it constituted a 'brave attempt to explain the pedagogical potentialities of the old system.' In the conclusion to this chapter Davie states that

> 'the striking thing about Scottish culture till about 1850 - at least as Jardine and his circle regarded it - was the continuation of scholastical intellectualism , as it was exemplified both in the predominent position of philosophy in regard to other subjects, and in the system of examination and tuition by public debate in class about first principles.' [40]

In the course of this thesis I will return to these points raised by Davie to consider them in the light of the events of the successive phases already referred to. In this section I wish to consider the more general aspects of the work produced by Davie.

One of the outstanding strengths of 'The Democratic Intellect' is its linkage of the educational context with other facets of Scottish life. Davie is quite explicit in his introductory essay that he wishes to replace

> 'sectarian misinterpretations of Scottish history, putting in their place a more comprehensive point of view which gives the secular institutions of Scotland equal prominence with the sacred, and which sees the distinctive life of the country not in its religion alone but in the mutual interaction of religion, law and education.' [41]

In the course of this study we will have to question whether or not Davie satisfactorily delineates the nature of the connections between university reform and the changes taking place in the Church of Scotland and in the alterations in the position of the legal profession located in Edinburgh. 'The Democratic Intellect' is original in that it sets out to develop a new approach to the study of university reform. In particular we should draw attention to Davie's analysis of the reasons for the preservation of a distinctive 'social ethic' in Scotland at a time when the Union of the Crowns had existed for over two hundred years and when the Union of the Parliaments had taken place over one hundred years previously. Davie's formulation of 'unification in politics, separation in ethics' represents an important contribution to the discussion of the relationship between Scotland and England.

It is on this topic of the nature of education in the two old kingdoms that lies one of the central lacunæ of Davie's book, in my view. In his review of 'The Democratic Intellect' Horn observes that

> 'it would be extremely interesting and entirely relevant if he had explained how modern university curricula in England and Scotland, both derived from a common medieval tradition, came to differ so widely and so fundamentally.' [42]

In the next chapter of this thesis I will attempt to set the scene for the understanding of the differences that we will observe exist at the time of the Royal Commission of 1826 and at the founding of the University of London. It is, maybe, because of the genesis of his book that Davie fails to locate his study clearly in an explicitly detailed historical context. The review of the study by Storr suggests this is the case; he comments that

> 'The Democratic Intellect offers only a limited amount

> of information about the Scottish universities as such. Their history is not presented systematically for itself but rather in a piecemeal fashion to fit the general argument.'

The absence of a systematic approach is most clearly apparent in the way in which Davie deals with one of the central tenets of the book. Storr puts his criticism of Davie's work in this way

> 'he significantly fails to set the 'fall' of the Scottish universities into the international context of university reform in the nineteenth century.' [43]

Withrington's review of 'The Democratic Intellect' presents the same basic criticism in a slightly more specific way when the reviewer notes that

> 'It is difficult to agree with him that . . the reforming spirits of last century can so easily, so simply and neatly be distinguished into the two camps, Anglophil and traditionalist.' [44]

Davie's thesis can only really be pursued if he had presented a comparative study of events in Scotland and England. In particular he must be criticized for presenting an oversimplified view of 'English education.' The review written by Asa Briggs is generally very positive about Davie's work, but Briggs does point out that

> 'it attaches an absolutely monolithic quality to 'Southern values' in an age when there was rapid change both in Oxford and Cambridge as well as Scotland.' [45]

Similarly Simon's review of Davie's book details the same point in saying that the author 'rather unfairly' lumps together groups

that might more fruitfully be seen as quite distinct. Simon says

> 'the utilitarians who created University College, London in 1828, and the classicists of contemporary Oxford are equally regarded as enemies - purveyors of an "alien" culture. Since the professoriat at University College at this time was, in fact, largely composed of Edinburgh graduates, and since it originally set out to give a broad general education to all its students, there seems an error of interpretation here.' [46]

In the central section of this thesis I will set out to juxtapose Scottish university education against English university education to see if the implied thesis of Davie stands up to closer examination. However while pointing out some of the tasks that 'The Democratic Intellect' does not cover we should acknowledge that what the book does do is to provide an admirably stimulating and original general argument about the relationship of Scottish and English education in the nineteenth century.

The fact that Davie's treatment of the historical record is rather casual is noted by most reviewers. As I will make clear in the substantive part of this work the 'brief, inadequate and highly selective' footnotes, to use Briggs description, are a handicap to those wishing to take up the interesting and varied points raised by Davie. In the wider context in which Davie excells these are small points of criticism. The main strength of the work lies in the breadth of its vision.

In his influential paper on 'Curricula as Socially Organized Knowledge' Michael Young contrasts the problems facing Sociologists of Education with the achievement of Davie. In a footnote Young says

> 'It is ironical that the one outstanding study, which looks at the various social, cultural and institutional factors

> influencing the organization of knowledge, is by a philosopher, G.E. Davie.'[47]

Davie has impressed his audience with the freshness of his perspective. Hanham believes that 'The Democratic Intellect' has

> 'set a new tone in the historiography of higher education by concentrating attention on universities as battle grounds for rival systems of thought.'[48]

This is indeed the main contribution by Davie to the study of the universities. And yet it is also the source of a main weakness of the book. I have already observed that Davie fails to detail the state of university education in England; now I must offer the related criticism that Davie also fails to establish clearly the nature and source of the rival systems of thought that form such an important part of his thesis. Specifically I wish to suggest that this author's failure to analysis the categories he uses in his text leads him to misinterpret the events he studies. In the course of this thesis I will try to examine the hypothesis that the reform of university education in both Scotland and England can be understood in terms of the clash of the ideas of the aristocratic, professional and mercantile classes. This hypothesis will be discussed as an alternative formulation to that offered by Davie which sees the same events in terms of a clash between the 'traditionalists Scots' and the 'anglicizing faction.'

Briggs review of 'The Democratic Intellect' suggests that 'the book is perhaps best regarded as an invitation to further scholarship'. In the same vein Withrington observes that

> 'Dr Davie has certainly not plied his readers with an ingratiating wine; rather he has offered them a raw, pungent spirit which, though an arresting and invigorating draught, would have been improved by longer distillation

and some dilution.' [49]

It is with these points in mind that I now wish to start to study the area of interest awakened by the reading of 'The Democratic Intellect' to see if this study can answer some of the questions raised by Davie.

Chapter Two

The Origins of University Education in Scotland and England and their contrasting development up to 1820

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an historical background against which the events of the nineteenth century can be securely related. The intention is to draw attention to certain significant happenings in the histories of these two university systems up to 1820 in order to allow for a fuller understanding of the sequence of events that predated the changes and reforms discussed in the next four chapters.

And so this piece will commence by outlining the foundation of the five medieval university institutions at Oxford, Cambridge, St Andrews, Glasgow and Aberdeen. The account of the early years of each of these institutions will indicate that although the spread of these foundations was a consequence of the divisions and disruptions within the Holy Roman Empire these medieval universities shared a strong common inheritance.

In the middle and later sections of the chapter we will see that the separate histories of the Scottish and English nations played a significant part in the development of distinct university traditions in both countries and that even within one area local conditions lead to specific outcomes in the universities. For example, the contrasts between the University of Glasgow and the 'town college' in Edinburgh will be illustrated.

This chapter will chronicle the way in which the four Scottish universities and the two English institutions were involved in and altered by such events as the Reformation, the English Civil War, the

Revolution of 1689, the Act of Union and the Renaissance. As we will see some of these themes help us to account for the changes in the universities for a time, but it is difficult to identify enduring features of university history. The nature of the relationships between the church and the state and place of the universities in those relationships is a fairly constant feature of the chapter, but the nature of the relationships is not constant. Similarly the changing sets of social relationships clearly have an impact on university affairs, but we cannot assume that the three contending interest groups that we will feature in the study of the nineteenth century universities are important to the history of those institutions in the preceding centuries. However in this chapter I will establish that by the beginning of the last century the conditions existing in the Scottish and English universities were clearly linked to the varying influences of aristocratic, professional and mercantile classes.

From a purely practical point of view it must be indicated that to identify those historical features that are relevant to this thesis over a period of six hundred years it will be necessary to develop a critical attitude to secondary sources. In this section it will become apparent that in order to understand the continual changes taking place in the Scottish and English universities we must pay attention to a wide variety of non-educational phenomena.

The Medieval Foundation of English and Scottish Universities

One of the more notable features of the universities of the medieval world was that those institutions existed in an international community controlled from the Vatican in which scholars were able to move freely from one country to another with little regard for national boundaries. As the lingua franca of the learned world was Latin and as the unity of medieval Christendom created a job market that recruited internationally to fill positions in the bureaucracy of the Roman Catholic church few obstacles were placed in the way of students from countries without their own universities who wished to enrol in foreign countries. In these circumstances certain universities came to dominate the academic world by attracting the best scholars and the best students. Over the centuries the University of Bologna came to dominate southern Europe and the University of Paris rose to a position of pre-eminence in the northern half of Europe.

This open and free ideal was, however, regularly interrupted by disputes that arose either between the Pope and the local States or between the States themselves. In his seminal work on the universities of the middle ages Hastings Rashdall concludes that one such dispute between the Pope and Henry II was responsible for the establishment of a university in England. During a quarrel between Becket and his king a Royal Edict was issued that directed that students could only travel abroad with the express permission of the King. English academics working abroad and students wishing to gain a university education migrated to Oxford. Rashdall concludes

> 'The hypothesis of a migration is the only one which will account for the independence of the Oxford Masters and the absence of any organic connexion with an Oxford church. Evidence has been given to show that such a migration from Paris to England did take place about the year 1167 . . .'[1]

On the basis of this circumstantial evidence Rashdall fixes the founding of the University of Oxford from that time. With regard to Cambridge University the same authority says

> 'The first appearance of the Cambridge school upon the page of genuine history is in connexion with the great dispersion, which followed upon the Oxford 'suspendium clericorum' of 1209.'

Oxford clerics had, again, found themselves involved in a quarrel between the Pope and the King. In this dispute the 'town' supported King John while the 'gown' tended to take the side of Innocent III, the Pope. In Rashdall's account of the differences between these two groups he suggests that matters were aggravated when one of the scholars was involved in the accidental killing of a towns women. Rashdall records that

> 'The Masters and scholars, after the manner of their class throughout Europe, hastily dispersed. Some went to Reading . . others to the great Mother-university of Paris; others to Cambridge.'[2]

By 1214 King John had been forced to submit to the authority of the Pope and so Oxford able once again to become a home for scholars. In that same year the fledgling university received its first official recognition by the Pope with the granting of certain privilages to the returning scholars.

It seems likely that with the return of the exiles from Oxford to their home base that the teaching at Cambridge may have lapsed. However by 1233 Cambridge had established itself enough for it to be recognized as a centre of learning by the Pope. In his work on the universities Green says

> 'Although Cambridge attracted less attention than Oxford . . neither in its character nor in its curriculum did it differ much from the older foundation . . Oxford and Cambridge had become the chief centres of learning in England by the middle of the thirteenth century.'[3]

It was as a result of a later interruption to the free movement of scholars that the first university in Scotland owed its origins. Upto 1411 Scots students were in the habit of travelling abroad to study. In his work on Scotland in this period Nicholson notes that the majority of Scottish students went to Paris. He says

> 'Of the 400 Scots who are known to have graduated in the period 1340 and 1410 . . . there were 230 who studied at Paris, 55 at Orleans, 34 at Avignon and 90 had been granted English safe-conducts to study at Oxford and Cambridge but it is a strange mystery that only 11 of these can be shown to have done so.'[4]

This mystery is, maybe, not so strange as it appears. Even though Scottish students came to the English universities it should not be assumed that they did so without some problems. It was a common practice in the medieval universities to divide the students from different areas into separate 'nations' with a view to reducing the clashes that might result from everybody being thrust together. In his paper on nationalism in the middle ages Coulton points out that

> 'At Oxford . . . the nationalistic division between the students from the north or south of the Trent became an integral part of the constitution . . . Nor were such divisions merely sentimental; they were severely practical.'[5]

Further evidence of that practicability can be found in the history of the University of Oxford written by Sir Henry Lyte in which he says

> 'the cosmopolitan character of the university was very unfavourable to the maintenance of good discipline. The schools were frequented by impetuous young men, coming from different countries and speaking different languages, who viewed one another with distrust and antipathy.'[6]

In all Lyte makes it fairly clear that Scotsmen were unwelcome at the university even if they were in possession of safe-conduct passes. At one point in a section on the university in the fourteenth century Lyte says that 'there was no surer way of irritating a native of Durham or Northhumberland than by calling him a Scot.'[7]

It seems quite likely that one source of the antagonism between the different nations would be a reflection of ecclesiastical differences. Between 1378 and 1417 Europe was deeply divided by the 'Great Schism' - a dispute that revolved around a disagreement as to the validity of conflicting claims to the title of Pope. Nicholson says

> 'it was mostly, but not entirely, international politics that at first decided the prevailing attitude in each country.'

England and the bulk of European states supported the claims of the successors of Urban VI, but France and her old ally Scotland took the side of the 'anti-Popes', as they came to be called, who were based in Avignon. In Nicholson's view

> 'Scotland had a natural desire to follow the opposite course to that of England.'[8]

So when in 1408 France abandoned the anti-Pope and left Scotland standing alone in her support for Benedict XIII the intellectual and political ties between France and Scotland were threatened. Scottish students studying abroad in France and other European countries found that they

were unwelcome in France and in most European countries. In these circumstances they were forced to return to their homeland where they congregated at St Andrews, the ecclesiastical capital of Scotland. Here the students and masters were taken under the wing of Bishop Wardlaw. As a supporter of the anti-Pope Wardlaw saw the chance to set up a university in St Andrews and, therefore, lost no time in asking Benedict XIII to issue a series of Papal Bulls that would bring recognition to this small coastal town. No doubt as a gesture of gratitude for Scotland's loyality in the 'Great Schism' Benedict duly acceded to Wardlaw's request and the Bulls were issued. They arrived in St Andrews in 1414 amid much celebration.

Within five years of these events the 'Great Schism' ended with the defeat of the anti-Popes. As a result the masters and students who had settled in Scotland were attracted back to the old centres of education on the continent where their chances of gaining appointments in the clerical bureaucracy of the Roman Catholic church were much better. In his section on St Andrews Rashdall notes that

> 'Circumstances were not . . . favourable to rapid growth. When Scotland decided in 1418 to obey Martin V ambitious students tended to resume emigration to famous continental schools, nearer the central power of the Papacy, whose patronage might be the reward of distinction.'[9]

However the unity of western Christendom was not to last for very much longer. The establishment of new university institutions in the four corners of Europe was one of the most clear indications of the disintegration of the notion of an international community of scholars. The founding of universities in England and Scotland was part of a general trend. In his history of the Scottish institution Cant refers to the international context when he says

> 'So long as Medieval Christendom remained anything of a reality, while the sense of a common unity was stronger than national differences, there was little need for local universities. By the fourteenth century, however, the medieval order was breaking down with the apparent failure of its own central ideal and the rise of a new temper of exclusive nationalism.'[10]

This reference to local universities is quite appropriate for in the same century as St Andrews was founded two other local universities were established in Scotland which were to take the notion of the identification of the university with the local area a stage further than anything that had been seen previously. In 1451 the Bishop of Glasgow successfully obtained the issue of the Papal Bulls to found a university in the town. At that time Glasgow was 'a village of perhaps 1,000 souls isolated from the rest of Scotland'[11] according to Robertson. From the geographical arrangement of the nations of the new institution Rashdall concludes that the university was expected to serve 'the west generally, not without regard to Ireland.' About forty years later James IV made an application to Pope Alexander to approve the establishment of a further Scottish university in Aberdeen under the patronage of Bishop Elphinstone. Permission was granted and Elphinstone persuaded Hector Boece, a highly regarded teacher working in Paris, to accept the position of Principal. Rashdall reports that Boece's teaching 'soon placed Aberdeen at the head of the Scotch universities.'[12]

These Scottish universities differed slightly from the two English medieval foundations in that the teachers were both college teachers and university teachers at the same time whereas in Oxford, for example, the emphasis was on the tutorial teaching within each college while the university teaching practically disappeared.

The traditional medieval degree course was developed to serve the needs of those destined for a career in the church. Although their study had a theological content all students at the universities were required to complete the preliminary arts course before moving on to specialise in theology, medicine or law. Green maintains that the arts course was

> 'rooted in the traditional syllabus of Roman times, the trivium, comprising grammar, rhetoric and logic, and the quadrivium of arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy.'[13]

So far as instruction was concerned the usual method of teaching was in the form of lecture and disputation where arguments were presented by the students which could be challenged by the master or by other students.

With the decline in the number of opportunities for students to enter the bureaucratic structure of the Catholic church that resulted from the decline in the power of the church the universities were forced to cater for wider needs. In his book on the university in Britain between 1500 and 1700 Hugh Kearney contrasts the education given to 'scholars' with that given to 'gentlemen'. His work offers a rare overview of this period. He suggests that

> 'a university curriculum did not exist in a vacuum but formed part of a wider social picture. Changes in the curriculum could take place for social, political or religious reasons as much as intellectual ones.'[14]

More specifically Kearney describes the transformation that took place in the two English universities in the Tudor period. He indicates that

> 'The majority of those engaged in higher studies at Oxford and Cambridge spent their time in the study of canon law.'[15]

The study of church law was popular as legal expertise was an increasingly important qualification for those hoping to gain ecclesiastical appointments. However a dramatic change took place so far an English graduates were concerned with the failure of the canon lawyers to resolve the question of Henry VIII's divorce to the King's satisfaction. The system of appeal to Rome was abolished with the proclaimation of Protestantism. The Act of Supremacy and the decision by Thomas Cromwell to forbid the teaching of canon law in the universities in 1535 meant that the common lawyers found themselves in a newly elavated position. The switch to a legal system based on custom and precedent had an effect on the universities. Instead of being the centre of legal education they found themselves on the edge as the practice and teaching of law become centralized in London. Kearney notes that in the change from canon to common law the

> 'real victors were the Inns of Court, which now became the dominent institutions for legal education in the realm. The triumph of the common lawyers was complete.'[16]

The Inns of Court had originally been founded in the fourteenth century in response to the demand for lay lawyers who could deal with disputes that were brought before the Kings Court. As the King was based in London the lawyers and the courts were based there also. The four Inns of Court grew out of the hostels located in a lane next to the palace of a Bishop who had been Chancellor of England. Armytage says that in 1425

> 'they had developed a collegiate character with over two hundred students apiece, larger in fact than any of the Oxford or Cambridge colleges.'[17]

In addition to this loss the English universities also failed to develop as centres for the education of those entering the medical profession. As with the legal profession those wishing to pursue a medical career tended to concentrate themselves into the area where

the work was and so the profession became centred on the London hospitals. The surgeons who practiced in these hospitals formed themselves into a guild in 1368 and in 1540 they united with the barbers guild to make the Barbers Surgeon Company. In his paper in the Annals of the Royal College of Surgeons MacNalty says

> 'The Company of Barber Surgeons undoubtedly raised the study and practice of surgery to a high level, organized professional teaching and standards, raised the social status and general education of the Surgeon and opened a new era in observation and treatment of surgical maladies.'[18]

The failure of Oxford and Cambridge to cater for the requirements of the legal and medical professions was not the only problem they faced. The dissolution of the monasteries between 1535 and 1540 also hit these two institutions. The universities lost their monastic colleges and the monks and friars,who had been a feature of English university life,disappeared. All in all Oxford and Cambridge were forced to rethink their aims. Kearney suggests that as time passed they changed from catering solely for the church to offering courses that would attract students from the ranks of the gentry. Kearney indicates that by the end of the sixteenth century

> 'The universities lost a good deal of the professional character which had been so marked a feature of the pre-Reformation period. They continued to train the secular clergy, but the emphasis was upon intellectual formation, not technical training in law.'[19]

Having regard to the changes he draws attention to Kearney finds it surprising that the English universities survived 'when the obvious place for higher education was London, near the 'third university', the Inns of Court.' Kearney goes on to suggest that the influence of Thomas Cromwell was the crucial factor in the universities continued

existence, for it was Cromwell who was responsible for the establishment of the Regius Professorships in 1540 and for the foundation of the 'royal colleges' of Trinity College in Cambridge and Christ Church at Oxford. According to Kearney these two institutions were

> 'academic palaces, where Peterhouse and Corpus had been poor hostels. The royal colleges were clearly intended to dominate the universities in a way without precedent. They broke new ground in providing encouragement for layman to take up university education.' [20]

Kearney concludes that the object of these endowments was control. He notes that the universities began to cater for the 'educational needs of the lay ruling elite' and that as a result the gentry class enrolled in increasing numbers between 1530 and 1570.

This trend towards a more secular Oxford and Cambridge in the Elizabethian era is also noted by G.M. Trevelyan in his 'English Social History'. He draws attention to the fact that

> 'A larger proportion of the undergraduates now looked forward to careers as layman. The number of great Elizabethians who had been at Oxford or Cambridge is significant of a new attitude to learning in the governing class. A gentleman, especially if he aspired to serve the State, would now finish his education at one of the 'learned universities' whence he usually came away with a familiar knowledge of the Latin language and of classical mythology, a smattering of Greek, and a varying measure of mathematical and philosophical acquirements.' [21]

Trevelyan accounts for the 'growing connexion between the

universities and the governing class' to the improvement in the conditions of academic life and, particularly, to the trust careful parents placed in the college system and the establishment of the private tutor system.

Reformation to the Revolution of 1689

Unlike their counterparts south of the border the Scottish universities were able to retain control over both legal and medical education. Their location in the centres of population was undoubtedly a factor in this retention. Furthermore the northern universities were supported both by the King and by the government and were thus able to overcome the problems that arose out of the loss of monastic incomes. In these ways they were more fortunate than Oxford and Cambridge.

The rise in the power of the monarchies and the confiscation of the enormous wealth of the church that were associated with the Reformation had an impact on the universities in all parts of Europe. Scotland was no different; Rait maintains that

> 'The Reformation brought about a change in the Scottish university tradition. The old conception of a university could not survive the triumph of the new faith. . . . the universities were no longer a part of one great European community. They became, henceforth, more national in their character, and more local in their aims.' [22]

The wedge that developed between Catholic France and Protestant Scotland was to alter the situation for the universities of Scotland. In the post-Reformation era these institutions were forced to look in on themselves and to begin to cater for local needs rather than for international ones. So although the idea of an international community of scholars survived for many more years due to the mobility allowed through the common usage of Latin the movement of scholars was handicapped by the differences of religion. The old system of patronage did not survive the rise of nationalism.

The trauma over the split of medieval Christendom raised questions which were to lead to longlasting conflicts. Within the ranks of the adherents of the new Protestant religion in Scotland was a clash over the question of the relationship of the church and the state. The Presbyterian group took the view that the church should be independent of the state and that the King should not interfere with church politics. On the other hand the Episcopalians supported the King in his fight for control over the church and in particular of his right to appoint the Bishops. Naturally James VI was at the head of the Episcopalian group and, unlike previous Kings of Scotland, he was well versed in theological matters and was at the forefront of the debate with the Presbyterians. Over a period of time it became clear that Andrew Melville, the son of an Angus laird, was to lead the Presbyterian side in the dispute. Melville had studied at St Andrews before going to the continent to enrol at Paris and later to teach at Poitiers University. Before returning to Scotland Melville had spent a further six years in Geneva where he was closely involved in protestant theology at a time when the city was the focus of the development of Calvinist thought. On his return to Scotland Melville joined the General Assembly of the new church, but he held no official position in that church. He rose to a position of power through the development of a network of personal contacts made as a result of his work in the Scottish universities.

The differences between the Presbyterian and Episcopalian viewpoints had a social dimension. In general terms we may observe that the Presbyterians were interested in building a new society which would be more democratic than previous ones. They were aware that the church had been used in the past by more powerful sections of Scottish society to preserve the status quo. In their vision of a new society the influence of the church would have to be balanced by the power of the state. Kearney observes that

> 'Melville stood for central government by the urban godly against the local control of the rural aristocracy.'[23]

In the argument between the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians one of the central points in question was that of responsibility for administering church affairs. The Episcopalians wanted to see the Bishops retain control of church appointments and administration while the Presbyterians wished to introduce a more democratic system which would vest those responsibilities in a local committee of ministers, a Presbytery.Dickerson outlines the differences between these contesting groups when he says

> 'Taking his cue from England, James saw that in Episcopacy with bishops chosen and appointed by the Crown, lay his only hope of royal control over the Church, perhaps his only control over the State. So, in the contest between the Crown and the Kirk, James strove for the supremacy of the Crown, supported by the episcopal church; Melville strove for a church which contained no bishops who might be tools of the King, and a church which, under its General Assembly, was independent and free from any control of the State.'[24]

As we will see the fact that James took his model from England was a prelude of things to come. The differences between the Scottish version of Protestantism and English Protestantism had no direct impact on the events which form the main focus of this thesis, but we should note that the differences between Scottish and English society that we can detect in this period was to have an impact on the universities in the two countries at a later date.

Clearly Melville represented an attack on the values of the Scottish aristocracy. This social dimension of the religious dispute was of some significance. Writing about events one hundred years after Melville, Ferguson notes that

> 'A certain degree of social cleavage blurred the picture. Most of the nobles and a considerable number of the lairds

> inclined towards episcopacy, whereas tenants and burgesses were more apt to lean towards presbyterianism.'[25]

But let us get back to the immediate post-Reformation era. To the Presbyterians education was seen as playing a central role in the creation of the new society. John Knox, in his famous volume called 'The First Book of Discipline', envisaged a society with a national education system with the universities at its peak. As a result of this vision the universities were thrown into the middle of the conflict between the two groups. In delineating the differences between these two views Cant suggests that

> 'in general terms, it has been suggested that the Presbyterian view of education was democratic and the Episcopalian aristocratic.'[26]

A concrete embodiment of the differences between these two views arose in Aberdeen.King's College in Aberdeen came under the control of the Episcopalians who resisted all attempts to introduce the new ideas. In these circumstances Cant relates

> 'the state of the university at Aberdeen in 1593 seemed so "deficient" to the reformed and renaissance outlook of the Earl of Marischal that he decided to establish a new college of his own on the Glasgow model.'[27]

Marischal College was duly built not a mile away from the existing university in New Aberdeen. The original intention had been to offer courses that would supplement those provided by King's College and so in the early days the two institutions shared the same Chancellor. But by 1660 King's and Marischal had drawn apart as they came to represent the two contrasting approaches to education referred to previously. King's College retained its emphasis on Episcopalian values while Marischal began to put into practice the ideas of the Presbyterians. In fact King's College was the main centre for Episcopalian thought- a role

which Glasgow University performed for the Presbyterians. The main impetus for the Presbyterian reform movement came from Andrew Melville who used his position as Principal of the University of Glasgow to introduce the new ideas about the purposes of university education into Scotland. At Glasgow Melville created a new arts course which set out to restructure the university curriculum by having teachers specialise in one area of study rather than continuing with the medieval practice of regenting. Under the old system one teacher was expected to take a class of students through their entire four year course. The reforms introduced at Glasgow under the 'nova erectio' were soon taken up by the other Scottish universities. Melville moved across to St Andrews to help with the reform of Scotlands oldest university. In Cant's opinion the ideas of Melville

> 'formed the essential basis of Scottish university education throughout the seventeenth century.'[28]

Most of the new notions about university education were embodied in the 'towns college' which was founded in Edinburgh in 1582. An important feature of this new institution was that it was controlled by the town council. In his history of Edinburgh University Grant says

> 'The King . . . was to give full powers to the town council "with the advice of the Ministers" to found a college, or colleges, for the higher studies. And the municipal authorites and the clergy of Edinburgh were entrusted with the absolute control of higher education within the burgh.'[29]

Later the power vested in the local Ministers was not exercised and the town council gained complete control of the college. The extent of their powers can be gauged by reference to Horn's comments that

> 'The powers of the town council did not stop with patronage; they extended to minute regulations of every aspect of the administration and life of the college. From the sixteenth

> to the nineteenth centuries the town council frequently drew up rules for the conduct of various officials of the college . . .'[30]

Although the masters of the college objected to this control matters remained unchanged until the nineteenth century. After an uncertain start the new institution grew in stature until it became widely recognized as Scotlands fourth university.

It has already been indicated that the universities were closely involved in the dispute over ecclesiastical matters and Kearney takes this further when he says

> 'Thus the universities became a battleground in the running fight which developed in Scotland in the last two decades of the sixteenth century between church and state, in which the balance went first in favour of Melville and then of James VI.'[31]

The final victory of James was assured when he succeeded to the English throne in 1603. The power and prestige that the King acquired as a result of this union of the crowns of the two kingdoms was such that Melville was forced into admitting defeat and retreating into exile on the continent.

The long ascendancy of the Episcopalians from 1603 onwards was finally brought to an end by the Bishops War of 1639. This Scottish reaction to Episcopacy seriously weakened the position of Charles I in England. With the union of the Crowns of England and Scotland the political affairs in the two kingdoms became much more closely linked. In this way the Bishops War had an effect on the political scene in England in so far as it was a contributory factor towards the outbreak of the English Civil War in 1642. In his reflections on these events Kearney points out that

> 'Scotland was a poor country and its six colleges were small and locally based; (England boasted over thirty colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, most of which were richer and larger than any college in Scotland). This made for the emergence of what G.E. Davie has called 'The Democratic Intellect' but what might be more accurately termed 'The Professional Intellect.' The defects of this were more obvious than its virtues in the seventeenth century. The Scottish colleges were narrow in their curriculum and utilitarian in emphasis.'[32]

This author elaborates on the differences between the university systems in England and Scotland. He says of the Scottish system that their

> 'position in the towns provided them with a ready supply of urban, bourgeois students, a phenomenon which became more marked as the commercial side of Scottish life began to take on a new importance.'

This can be contrasted with developments in the two English universities which were situated in small market towns. The other significant difference that Kearney draws attention to was that

> 'The Scottish clergyman was not a gentleman like his English counterpart, the parson. Intellectual consequences followed from this simple fact. The universities followed quasi-professional courses which kept literary culture to the minimum and concentrated instead upon clerical subjects- logic, metaphysics, physics- in a more professional, perhaps more rigid mould than was the case in England.'[33]

The general theme of Kearney's argument seems to be that in England the universities clung to the emphasis on traditional scholasticism

and classical learning that served the purposes of graduates who were expected to become parsons or country gentlemen while in Scotland the first steps towards adopting a more utilitarian view of university education were being taken as a result of these institutions need to recruit undergraduates in a society in which there were few secure church livings and a small leisured class.

In his discussion of the 'radical critics of Oxford and Cambridge in the 1650s' Christopher Hill throws an interesting sidelight on this point. Hill says that the two universities were criticized by those who wished to see them take up the teaching of science. Hill indicates that these criticisms were not taken up. He says

> 'If Oxford and Cambridge had been institutions whose main concern was to serve the secular and economic needs of society, the demands of the modernizers would have been irresistable. But they were not. The main function of the universities was generally agreed to be the production of parsons. From the sixteenth century on gentlemen in increasing number were spending a year or two at the universities but they usually left without taking a degree. Some might have dilettante scientific interests . . . In any case, their interests and needs were peripheral to the main function of the universities.'[34]

After the English Civil War the two ancient universities were purged in order to ensure their subordination to the new order. But this purging did not have any long-term detrimental effects. The fact that these institutions had strong links with the prevailing property system, 'through their ownership of impropriated tithes'[35] meant that the strengthening of the position of those propertied interests after the war benefitted the universities. With the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 the Anglican monopoly of Oxford and Cambridge was re-established. Green maintains that this monopoly was the cause of many problems. He says

> 'The clerical control over the colleges was detrimental both to their efficiency and scholarship. The majority of fellowships had become the preserve of the Anglican clergy and were regarded as a stepping stone to preferment rather than an opportunity for genuine study and research . . . Tutorial duties once conscientiously carried out were now neglected . . . Many of the professors had ceased to lecture at all, since audience and stipend alike were impossibly small.'[36]

In his study of this period Kearney says

> 'the universities became the educational organs of a declining gentry and a declining church.'[37]

So far as Oxford was concerned this meant that 'academic conservatism' was the order of the day. Kearney comments that

> 'The combination of scholastic philosophy (logic, ethics, physics and meta-physics) and classical studies (oratory, poetry, history, grammar) . . . . seem to have remained the pattern for all Oxford.'[38]

The English universities came to cater for the 'young gentry' towards the second half of the sixteenth century. In Kearney's opinion the long term effect of this was that

> 'the universities were transformed from the essentially clerical institutions of 1500 into the lay institutions of 1600.'[39]

Certainly we can agree that the universities did not retain their exclusive clerical character and that as a result of the Civil War, and of the changes in the rural organization of agriculture, the gentry grew in importance.

One effect of the Civil War had been that the main barriers to the enclosure movement had been removed. The country landowners found it easier to reorganize agricultural production in their areas by reducing the amount of common land and by planning to produce an agricultural surplus that could be sold in the growing towns. As these effects took hold the social gap between the aristocracy and the gentry closed as the aristocratic order became more defined by wealth than birth. Barrington Moore states that

> 'From the gentry as a class, then, came the main representatives of a decisive historical trend modifying the structure of English rural society.'[40]

The process was to continue unabated into the eighteenth century.

1689 to the Enlightenment

The arrival of William and Mary on the throne of England lead to some constitutional difficulties, but their ascendency to the throne of Scotland was the cause of real difficulties. A revolt by the supporters of King James and political and religious in-fighting delayed the acceptance of the Scots of the Presbyterian Dutch monarchs. The revolution of 1689 was followed by a period of readjustment in most institutions of Scottish life, not least in the universities. In her study of the origins of the Scottish Enlightenment Rendall notes

> 'The revolution of 1689 was an important event in the history of the Scottish universities; a Parliamentary Commission was set up in 1690 to visit and examine the universities and to ensure their commitment to the Presbyterian church now again the Church of Scotland.' [41]

The Commission was most concerned to inquire into ecclesiastical and political questions rather than educational matters. An oath of allegance to the new King and Queen was demanded of all the Principals and Professors and those that refused to comply were usually removed from their posts. The short-term effects of this purge were clearly detrimental to the standards of education provided by the universities, but the long-term effects of the revolution of 1689 were more positive.

William Carstares, a Scottish presbyterian minister, was able to use his position as royal chaplain, confident and advisor to William to impliment plans he had developed for the improvement of the universities of Scotland. Carstares had been resident in Holland in the years before 1689 and had come back to Britain with William in 1689. As a result of his access to the ear of the King he was able to

persuade the Crown to assist the universities by granting a sum to help them cope with the difficulties they were facing in adjusting to the decline in the numbers of students enrolling. Furthermore Carstares succeeded in getting his brother-in-law, William Dunlop, appointed to the post of Principal of Glasgow University. In Chitnis's account of this period he maintains that

> 'Carstares used his political talents for dealing with some general problems in Scotland in the post-Revolution period, but in particular he was central to improvement in two of the Scottish universities, Glasgow and Edinburgh . . . . His own time in Holland and a desire to toady to his master had convinced Carstares how Scottish universities might be modelled on such institutions as Utrecht (where he himself studied) and Leyden.'[42]

In 1703 Carstares was made Principal of the University of Edinburgh where he was able to force the university to undertake some crucial reforms. Most importantly he was able to bring about a reform of the regenting system. Under this ancient system a pupil entering the university was assigned to a single Regent, or Master, whose class he remained in for the full four years of the Arts course. The logistics of this system of teaching made it difficult for the university to introduce new subjects into the curriculum. So when the regenting system was replaced by the professorial system under the influence of Carstares innovations could more easily be accomodated. Under the new system students were required to sign up for the courses offered by the professors who were now required to specialize in different areas of knowledge so as to provide a breadth of studies to the students. It became more common for new areas of study to be introduced as the university teachers realized that they could gain new students, and the resultant class fees, by responding to developments across various fields of knowledge. New professorial chairs were established at Edinburgh, and later, elsewhere.

One of the side effects of the change over from regenting to the professorial system was that the relationship between the student and the teacher underwent a significant alteration. No longer was one teacher a tutor for a known number of students. The students were freed from the harsh discipline that had typified the regenting system. Camic suggests that this reform was welcomed in the land and that

> 'the habits of good conduct that had been pounded into Scottish youths at home and in elementary school generally kept them on the straight and narrow during their stay in college.'[43]

Outside of university affairs the most important event in Scotland in this period was the union of the English and Scottish parliaments in 1707. Although the Scots maintained a long-standing distrust of their southern neighbours the Union of 1707 was widely seen in the north as being inevitable. Harvie highlights certain factors which support this view when he maintains that

> 'The experience of the 1690s bore witness to this. Four bad harvests brought the last and possibly the worse famine in the country's history. Their one attempt through the Company of Scotland at colonization in Central America perished in 1699 in the swamps of Darien. In Europe in the terms of trade were shifted against traditional Scottish activities. The ideal of austere independence had few takers; aristocrat and merchant alike looked South, the first attracted by political power and patronage, the second by an expanding English market and the possibility of liquidating his Darien losses.'[44]

There is considerable evidence to indicate that Scotland was able to retain a distinctive cultural life after the Union, but it

must be acknowledged that in other areas England was increasing her control over her northern neighbour. Smout concurs with this interpretation and suggests that there was a recognition of this fact at the time. He says

> 'early eighteenth century Scotland was, indeed as much as a dependent economy as any country could be in that age, tied specifically to England in commerce and decision-making, more generally to the countries of England, the Netherlands and France in technology and culture.'[45]

In practice the Scots cultural independence was such that it had concrete outcomes. Those Scots leaders who were in favour of of the Union were not 'anti-Scottish', but rather, as Harvie depicts, they

> 'recognized that parliament was only one among a range of national institutions. They argued that the safety and effectiveness of the Kirk, the law and the educational system were, in an age of limited governmental activity, worth sacrificing a parliament for.'[46]

In the short-term we will see that their interpretation of events was proved to be correct. Hence Withrington tells us that

> 'The passing of the Act of Union in 1707 is not itself directly significant for Scottish education.'[47]

As matters turned out for the universities they were not only uneffected by the Union, but protected from adverse interference by a clause in the Act. Hutchinson describes how

> 'An Act of the Scottish Parliament of 1705 had deemed that "the four Universities as established by law shall

> continue within the Kingdom for ever" and this provision was ratified by the Act of Union of March 1707, so that henceforth ultimate financial responsibility for the ancient Scottish universities resided in Westminster.'[48]

As the Westminster parliament had no interest in interferring with the universities in England there was a natural inclination for it to ignore developments in the Scottish universities. And so after a period during which the universities in Scotland had been interferred with continually they found themselves suddenly free of the fetters of national politics, at least on the day to day level. However there were some indirect consequences of the Union.

Whereas in the years before 1707 the city of Edinburgh had been the centre of life for the Scottish aristocracy in the period after the movement of the parliament to London the aristocracy, or at least the more influential and important members of the aristocracy, moved out of Edinburgh. In his account of Scotland in the eighteenth century Graham provides a graphic description of this transformation when he says

> 'The height of Edinburgh's glory was before the Union of 1707, in the days when meetings of the Scots Parliament drew to the capital nobles and persons of quality from every county . . . After 1707 all this was sadly changed . . . Instead of the throng of 145 nobles and 160 commoners . . there went the sixteen representative Peers and sixty Members of Parliament.'[49]

The vacuum left by the movement of the central figures of the Scottish aristocracy to London was finally filled by the members of the legal profession based in the capital city of Scotland. Harvie notes that

> 'As the eighteenth century wore on, legal families like the

> Forbeses, Dundases and Erkines took over from the aristocrats as the directors of Scottish politics.'[50]

In the post-Union era the four universities in Scotland went about their business. Out of these institutions it was the youngest one at Edinburgh which was to set the standards for the older foundations. Although the universities were left alone by the politicians at Westminster the political factions within the local communities took an active part in university affairs. This was particularly true in the case of Edinburgh and the university. The Town Council assisted in transforming the 'towns college' into an institution with an international reputation. A key figure in this work was George Drummond, an important figure in Edinburgh politics between 1715 and 1766. Drummond was closely involved in the organization of the drainage of the land on the north side of the city and with the subsequent development of the New Town.

For our purposes we should note that Drummond played an important part in the revitalization of Edinburgh University by using his position as the Provost of the city, and the town council's role as patron of the university, to work for improvements in the university. Smout describes his contribution under three headings when he says of Drummond that

> 'Firstly, in collaboration with Alexander Munro <u>primus</u> he worked towards the establishment of the first medical faculty in any university in the United Kingdom . . . Secondly, because he believed, with Munro, that teaching medicine had little point without a hospital in which the students could learn to recognize diseases and which patients themselves could be expertly relieved, he and Munro set out to build the Royal Infirmary . . . Thirdly, he took a lively and indeed critical interest in the appointment of professors of excellence and distinction to chairs in the college . . . '[51]

The model for the development of the medical faculty came from Holland where Munro had studied at Leyden University under the medical professor Hermann Boerhoave.

On a more general vein Cant maintains that in this period the universities of Scotland continued to be regarded as part of a national system of education. Unlike Oxford and Cambridge

> 'the close links between the universities and society made it less likely that they would become backwaters of privileged indolence or that they would be swept out of touch with reality by any new wind of intellectual change.'[52]

This indeed seems to have been the case. In particular the universities were answerable to the community through the system of professorial appointment. Sometimes this exercise of patronage was not so much based on right, but on practice. The colleges were expected to be responsive to the needs of the people who supported them and sent their children to be educated there. Emerson maintains that

> 'Appointments to university posts in Scotland were not made by any faculty without regard to the wishes of Chancellors, Rectors, the Crown and its servants, local gentlemen, merchants or ministers.'[53]

While at Edinburgh the town council were the organ through which the community worked in Glasgow the professoriate were in the central position. Emerson suggests that not all groups in the local area held equal sway - in fact he says

> 'Untitled polticians and lawyers were the dominant groups in Scotland after 1707. They were the country's improvers and enlightened men, so it is not surprising that their

> proteges in the colleges reflect their interests in economic development, agricultural innovation, 'moderatism', belles lettres and a curriculum that was useful, polite and career-oriented.'[54]

The teachers appointed to the positions in the Scottish universities were rewarded on the basis of the number of students they could attract into their classes. There was every incentive for the professors to extend the traditional curriculum to cater for the new interests of the age; in this context Withrington indicates that

> 'while good and proper pedagogical reasons might be brought forward for these developments, early in Edinburgh and rather later elsewhere, it is hardly to be doubted that it was their financial attractiveness to the teachers which was of the first importance.'[55]

While the teachers in the Scottish universities were thus encouraged to respond to the requirements of the time their counterparts at the two ancient English universities were in a quite different position. In his study of the history of education in Britain Curtis refers to the fact that

> 'A considerable number of new professorships had been established during the last century, but some Chairs were so poorly remunerated that they failed to attract men of learning and ability. Most of the actual teaching was undertaken by the college tutors.'[56]

The college tutors may have been hard working but the standards of education at both Oxford and Cambridge were not high. There was a tendency amongst the upper-classes to employ private tutors rather than send their sons to public schools and the universities. The admissions at the English universities at the beginning of the eighteenth century were falling rapidly. Both universities were

encumbered with outdated statutes which stifled the possibility of reform. In an address about Oxford University in the eighteenth century Sutherland says

> 'the University . . . was bound hand and foot by the Laudian code of statutes imposed on it in 1636, which were explicitly intended to prevent its changing of them by its own decisions, and which were conceived in such detail that every iota of its curriculum and degree structure and the working of all its institutions were prescribed for it.'

Sutherland concludes that the university stagnated and that

> 'Under the iron hand of the Laudian statutes it was hopelessly out of touch with the needs of the times.'[57]

Cambridge University was similarly effected by the Elizabethian statutes which had been passed in the previous century. The role of the Anglican church at both universities did not lead to many improvements in the educational provisions at those institutions. At Oxford and Cambridge the fellowships came to be regarded as stepping stones to preferrments elsewhere. The fellows sometimes even failed to take up residence in the two towns. Although Green agrees that the English universities were going through a bad period he suggests that their deficiencies were exaggerated. He says

> 'Both universities were the targets of Grub Street publicists, Deists, Dissenters and plain Whigs who did not mince their words and deliberately blackened the universities reputation. Their intemperate sallies helped to create the picture of the eighteenth-century university which is still with us.'[58]

However Green does acknowledge that the education provided in

these two institutions was narrow and restricted. Both Oxford and Cambridge served only a small section of the society in which they existed. This exclusivity was one of the main causes of complaint levelled against them. Green indicates that

> 'The dissenters, especially influential among the mercantile and professional classes, whose own academies compared so favourably with the universities at this time, criticized the obligation to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles which virtually debarred Non-conformists from admission to Oxford and prevented them from taking a degree at either university.'[59]

The very fact that Oxbridge were attacked for their religious exclusiveness meant that the defenders of the universities were able to argue that the reform movement was part of an attack on the role of the Church of England as the established religion in the land. So the defence of the two English universities centred on the strength of the connection between the Church and the State. Until well into the nineteenth century the debate over university reform in England was dominated by the question of the position of the Church vis-à-vis the universities.

Therefore for a significant part of the eighteenth century little was done to improve the education offered by Oxford and Cambridge. The fellows of the colleges in these two market towns were left free to proceed without outside interference. Those who were in a position to enquire into any possible abuses taking place declined to do so because they assumed that any complaints were only motivated by those trying to call into question the very structure of aristocratic society.

The Enlightenment to the Nineteenth-century

As the two universities in England were suffering from a decline in the number of students enrolling the two lowland universities in Scotland underwent a period of boom. Between 1730 and 1760 both the universities at Edinburgh and Glasgow grew in size and stature. They rose to achieve an international reputation for the quality and variety of the courses under offer and, as a result, they attracted students from all parts of Britain and even from the more distant corners of the English-speaking world. Due to the system of payment the Professors at the two universities were paid well if their classes were full and this in turn meant that these institutions were able to attract and retain the very best teachers. However, according to William Thom, the system of payment was open to abuse. Writing in 1762 Thom complained that

> 'A place in a university is considered as easy, honourable and lucrative. It is almost looked upon as a sinecure; it is not ordinarily the most ingenious and able for teaching that is pitched (sic) upon, but he who is connected or whose friends are connected with and can serve the men in power . . . A man's sufficiency is seldom or never mentioned; his ability is no recommendation of him; his total ignorance of the things he is to teach is no obstacle to his being preferred to the office.'[60]

In his discussion of the appointment of Edinburgh professors by the town council Smout indicates that the political context in which the decisions were made was not a narrow one. He suggests that the political machinations of the council should be understood in a national context and that

> 'it was not, of course, a democratic body; it itself had

> 33 members who normally nominated their own successors, but the political 'managers' of Scotland contrived on behalf of the British government to see that only loyal Whigs achieved any office of significance within the council, and that Jacobites and Tories favourable to the old Stewart cause felt the cold wind of disfavour.'[61]

The lowland universities should be distinguished from the institutions at St Andrews and Aberdeen. The growth of Edinburgh and Glasgow was quite different from the progress of the two other universities. The divisions of an intellectual nature between these groups of institutions is, maybe, a reflection of a more widespread division within eighteenth-century Scottish society. In geographical terms the division was between the lowlands and the highlands and in political terms we may notice a split that distinguished lowland Whigs from Jacobite wing of the Tory party whose support was concentrated in the highlands. The clearest evidence of these divisions can be found in the events of 1715 and 1745. Whereas the Jacobite Rebellions are sometimes represented as expressions of Scottish nationalism Webb maintains that the fact that in both cases

> 'the majority of the fighting men came from the highlands, the stronghold of Catholicism and Episcopalianism'[62]

did not endear their cause of the lowlanders who were mostly of the presbyterian faith. Harvie adds support of this interpretation of events when he points out that

> 'More Scots had fought for Cumberland than for Charles Edward; more Scots than English soldiers thereafter wasted the glens.'[63]

The division of Scotland into Highlands and Lowlands takes on a particular significance if attention is given to the fact that in the period between 1740 and 1830 the Lowlands was the centre of an

intellectual ferment that came to be called the Scottish Enlightenment. During that time Lowland Scotland gained an international reputation for its original contributions to learning. In her book on this period Rendall indicates that

> 'During the eighteenth century, and particularly from 1740 on, Scottish writers gained international recognition for the range of their learning, for the originality and penetration of the writings on philosophy, history, law and science, and for their centres of enlightened civilization in Edinburgh and Glasgow.'[64]

Rendall contrasts these developments with the lack of anything similar in the centres of learning in England. During this period the city of Edinburgh became known as 'the Athens of the North', a name that drew attention to her intellectual and architectural development. This presents an interesting contrast to her previous name of 'old reckie', which drew attention to the deficiencies of her sewage system.

Smout's study of the Scottish people up to 1830 contains the opinion that

> 'The great majority of those Lowlanders who made any notable contribution to the cultural golden age came from the middle class.'[65]

So although Adam Smith was the son of a customs officer from Kirkcaldy and David Hume was the second son of a laird, the likes of Adam Ferguson, Dugald Stewart and Sir Walter Scott were from the middle strata of lowland society.

For our purposes it is important to note that the Scottish Enlightenment was closely connected with the lowland universities. In his social history of the Enlightenment Chitnis states that

> 'the Scottish Enlightenment centred even more on the universities than on the Church or the law, not least because professors predominated among the intellectuals.'[66]

The renown of the Scottish professoriat was such that we ought to assume that William Thom's comments about the situation at Glasgow in 1762 was an indication of times past rather of things to come. Support for this interpretation can be gained from Smout's comments that

> 'it is hard . . . to imagine the golden age without the universities, who educated so many of the leaders and later harboured a high proportion of the most distinguished intellectuals in their chairs.'[67]

The transformation in the intellectual climate of Scotland in this period was outstanding. No better indication of this change could be found than in the words of a severe critic of Scottish life in the seventeenth century, Trevor-Roper. This historian asks

> 'By what social, political or intellectual alchemy did a country which had recently seemed so barbarous - suddenly- in the fashionable jargon of the Sociologist- 'take off'? At the end of the seventeenth century Scotland was a by-word for irredeemable poverty, social backwardness, political faction. Its universities were the unreformed seminaries of a fanatical clergy. A century later, in one field at least, it was the teacher of Europe; and some of the most enterprising Englishmen sent their sons, some of whom would become British cabinet ministers, not to Oxford or Cambridge, but to Edinburgh or Glasgow.'[68]

The reason for the success of the Scottish universities in recruiting the sons of 'enterprising Englishmen' was not entirely

due to the excellence of these institutions; sometimes more worldly considerations played a part. In particular we may note that political factors were significant; Halsey notes that

> 'Some Whig families sent their cleverer sons for further education to the Scottish universities'[69]

as an alternative to studying at Oxbridge or even to the prospect of undertaking the 'grand tour.' This later possibility become utterly impractical during the Napoleonic Wars and the universities of Scotland benefitted as a result. Amonst the 'cleverer sons' referred to by Halsey we will come across Lord John Russell, Lord Palmerston, the Marquis of Lansdowne and Lord Melbourne.

An indication of the social composition of the alumni of the Scottish universities is provided by Mathew in his study of the matriculation records of the University of Glasgow between 1740 and 1839. In this work the author concentrated his attention of four decades (1740-9, 1765-74, 1790-9 and 1830-9) and, amongst other matters, looked at the descrition of the occupations of the fathers of the students. Following the presentation of the table of figures Mathew writes

> 'The two most significant trends in the figures appear in the 'Industry and Commerce' and 'Nobility and Landed' groups. The formers percentage increased from 26.2 to 49.9 between the first and third decades and remained at the later level over the 1830s. The movement in the second group was in the opposite direction; a decline from 31.9% in the 1740s to 6.7% in the 1830s.'[70]

The figures indicate that the representation of the nobility and landed classes declined in numbers most rapidly between 1740-9 and 1765-74 as by the later date only 14.1% of the students were from

this class. Mathew speculates that

> 'These trends would seem to reflect the changing class structure in a time of industrialization.'

This conclusion seems rather doubtful for the aristocratic class retained a central place in the national arena well into the nineteenth century. It seems more likely that Mathews subsiduary comments are much closer to the mark. He says

> 'Members of the Scottish upper classes, further, were tending to send their sons to England for their education towards the end of our period . . . a feeling prevailed that Scottish cities, Glasgow especially, hardly provided an environment sufficiently civilized for the noble and refined.'[71]

And so we can see that the movement of students across the Tweed was two-way. Mathew's comments about the upper classes view of the city of Glasgow lead us on to a further point.

So far the view of the Scottish universities in the eighteenth century gives the impression that the two lowland universities were the innovators and that St Andrews and Aberdeen followed their lead. This is an accurate representation of the general picture, but it does fail to establish the differences between the developments in Glasgow and Edinburgh. These two cities, according to Smout

> 'represented in their different ways the qunitessence of two streams of middle-class life, Edinburgh dominated by the professional classes, and Glasgow by the triumph of the commercial and manufacturing interests.'[72]

From a statistical analysis of the first street directories of

the cities in the 1770s and 1780s Smout produces a table of figures which, he concludes, indicates that

> 'Edinburgh attracted five times as many noblemen and gentry as Glasgow even in 1773, and the proportion would be much larger fifty years later when the New Town in the capital was completed.'[73]

In contrast to this Smout's table indicates that 'Merchants and Manufacturers' comprised 30.0% of Glasgows population, but only 12.5% of Edinburgh's and that roughly the reverse proportions applied to the numbers of 'professional men' in each city (that is Edinburgh 28.8% and Glasgow 12.3%).

These contrasts are of some significance when we come to appreciate that one of the features of the Scottish universities was that they came to serve their local communities. Both Edinburgh and Glasgow universities responded to the demands of the local community by founding new chairs. Smout recounts that

> 'In the eighteenth century, Edinburgh (which was throughout the pacemaker) added four chairs in law between 1707 and 1722, a Faculty of Medicine in 1726 . . . a chair of Rhetoric in 1760 and four chairs in science - Chemistry, Natural History, Astronomy and Agriculture.'[74]

Glasgow followed the same general lines of development. In the course of the century we can observe that Edinburgh gained renown for its professional studies and for the cultural dimension of those studies while Glasgow developed mathematical and scientific studies which served the commercial and agricultural interests that were gathered around this rapidly expanding city.

The expansion of both Glasgow and Edinburgh had an effect on the whole lowland area. Ferguson observes that

> 'Urban growth, by providing large markets . . . . stimulated the zeal for agrarian changes. Thus, the wealthy merchants of Glasgow were by the 1760s helping to transform the agriculture of Clydesdale, while the growth of the city exercised an influence on the whole of the agricultural south-west. Similar effects were produced in the south-east by the increased population of Edinburgh and the wealth of the legal profession.' [75]

The curriculum of the Scottish universities expanded to cater for the needs of these agricultural interests. The empirical attitude to farming found in the lowlands of Scotland was informed by the studies taking place in the universities.

In the first two decades of the nineteenth century the universities in both Scotland and England increased their enrolments. In some ways their contrasting development meant that they provided a complimentary service to each other. In his article on the concept of 'internal colonialism' Furniss postulates that the universities of Scotland provided an expertise that was demanded by the Industrial Revolution and the expansion of the British Empire. He says

> 'In a country needing engineers, doctors, teachers, literate military officers and colonial administrators, the absence of English education provisions left a vacuum for others to fill. For university graduates (in 1830 there were 440 university places in Scotland, 60 per cent of the British total), the opportunities afforded by free labour mobility within Britain and through access, to the Empire was essential.' [76]

During the eighteenth century the universities at Oxford and Cambridge suffered a decline in the numbers of students, but they continued largely uneffected; their generous endowments allowed them to rise above these temporary difficulties. In his social history of this period Porter says

> 'Oxford () and Cambridge() became more genteel, luxurious and costly, and so deterred poorer students . . . Oxford's crypto-Jacobite politics repelled some, as did the ultra-modern curriculum based on geometry, mathematics and Newtonian science which Cambridge evolved in its sleep.'

Porter concludes that London was the centre of literary and intellectual ferment and that

> 'the universities became rather pocketfuls of patronage and the starting line in the race for church livings.'[77]

As English society was able to provide many positions in the gift of the powerful men of affairs the universities were not required to participate in the selective process for entry into rewarding positions as was the case in Scottish society. The route to those positions was through the social cultivation of the manners of a 'gentleman' and not through a competitive educational system. In his outline of Oxford and Cambridge at the beginning of the nineteenth century Ashby notes that

> 'the professional faculties of theology, law and medicine, had long ago been allowed to atrophy, and the colleges concentrated in what in medieval times was simply the prerequisites for professional education : studies in the faculty of arts . . . until late into the nineteenth century the emphasis of these two universities was on the all-round education of a privileged class, not on the disinterested pursuit of learning.'[78]

As we have noted this 'all-round education' was developed at Oxford into the study of the classic languages of Latin and Greek while at Cambridge the emphasis was on mathematics. Both universities suffered from the fact that during the century the existing view of liberal education did not specify a university education. In his book on tradition and changes in English liberal education Rothblatt says

> 'In the eighteenth century a liberal education did not assume, and certainly did not require, residence at a university.'[79]

Rothblatt explains how the 'courtesy book' acted as a guide to the form of acceptable values and mores of respectable society. He then suggests that

> 'The theory of liberal education being a theory of character formation, stressed the education of the whole man. The courtesy book held up the model of a gentleman whose mind and manners were in perfect accord, whose deportment was as much as his intellect or knowledge was an indication of proper education.'[80]

According to these standards the universities of England failed on two main counts. Firstly they failed to provide appropriate recreational facilities deemed as 'essential to the development of the Renaissance personality' in so far as they offered no instruction in fencing, dancing, riding, falconry or hunting. And secondly, there were no women, or almost no women of quality, in the university community with whom the students could practice the social graces.

The decline in the number of graduates from the two universities in the eighteenth century is well documented. However the English universities did not entirely lose their association with aristocratic society. Rothblatt notes that the status and financial position of

the clergy in England improved visibly. He points out that the beneficed clergy profited from

> 'the extraordinary changes in the structure of farming that occured in the second half of the eighteenth century and from the inflated prices paid for grain during the wars against France.'[81]

As a result of these changes the clergy received an increased income which allowed them to adopt a life style more like that of their gentry neighbours. In these circumstances the younger sons of the gentry were recruited into the church to such an extent that Rothblatt can accurately observe that

> 'The rise in clerical status between the mid-Georgian period and the end of the Napoleonic War is a very significant historical change.'[82]

We noted in the opening chapter that there was some dispute about the attendence of the nobility at Oxford and Cambridge during the eighteenth century. Stone's study of the size and composition of the Oxford student body is based on the analysis of student/father ratio over a period of time and resulted in the statement that

> 'the conclusion seems inescapable: throughout the late 17th and 18th centuries a smaller and smaller proportion of the children of the social elite was attending Oxford university.'[83]

However, a more recent study of 'the peerage in the eighteenth century' by John Cannon reaches a conclusion which is at varience with that of Stone. Cannon states that

> 'We have established that an increasing proportion of

> the English peerage was educated at Oxford and Cambridge and this is at a time when, for much of the period, admissions generally to the universities were falling.'

As we have previously seen Cannon thinks that the aristocracies influence at the two universities was at its peak at this time.

The agricultural revolution served to strengthen the position of the richest landowners and as the universities played a role in the reinforcement of their status they were to grow in importance as well. The gentlemanly ideal was to once again become linked with university education in the nineteenth century as a growing sub-aristocratic class came to realize that the acquisition of aristocratic-like status could be achieved. One of the distinctive features of the English aristocracy was that it was an 'open' elite in so far as over a generation or so the nouveau-riche could aspire to upward mobility. The universities were to play a central role in these circumstances.

Statistical verification of the impact of the landowning class on English society can be gleaned from Jenkins and Jones' study of 'Social Class of Cambridge University Alumni of the 18th and 19th Centuries.' For the period from 1752 to 1799 these authors figures indicate that 38% of the students' fathers were 'land-owners or of that Class.'[85]

Summary

To fulfill the purpose of this chapter we ought to summarise the position at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In particular we need to annotate the differences between the universities in Scotland and England and to indicate the contrasts within those two systems.

One of the first features we can observe is that in Scotland the relationship of the church and the universities was significantly different from that in England. While in the south the clergy were the dominant occupational group in university affairs in Scotland it was the lawyers who occupied that position. In England the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge were under the close control of the Church of England who viewed any attack on the status quo as an attack on the role of the Anglican Church as the established religion of the state. In so far as the universities were national institutions this association of the church, and its aristocratic supporters, with the political and social domination of the aristocracy resulted in a mutual support system that was difficult to challenge. In Scotland the church was more democratic in its government and, therefore, its impact on Scottish society was unlike that of the Church of England. The general tenor of social life in the north was reflected in the universities in that they were more democratic than those in England and were, as a result, more responsive to local requirements. As we have seen Edinburgh and Glasgow served slightly different social groups from each other and from those in England.

In this way the three contending social groups that form the main focus of our studies in the next chapters will be seen to have established links with the universities in various parts of the British Isles. The link between the aristocracy and the two English universities were strengthened in the later quarter of the eighteenth century and in the first half of the nineteenth century. The University of Edinburgh had well established connections with the

professional classes, particularly the lawyers, in lowland Scotland and the University of Glasgow was the first institution in the tertiary sector to give any attention to the requirements of the mercantile section of the middle class.

So at the beginning of the period that forms the central focus of this thesis we should note that the curriculum of the six universities in Britain was not uniform; it clearly reflected the varying influences of the classes on the universities.

Furthermore we must record the fact that the teaching staff of the Scottish universities were subjected to a much greater degree of accountability for their everyday practices than their counterparts at Oxford and Cambridge. The effect of this was that the standard of teaching, especially at the two lowland universities, was higher in Scotland than in the south as the professorships in Scotland carried more social prestige and potential income than the sinecures that existed at Oxford and Cambridge. Men of talent were attracted to the Scottish universities whereas in England the universities were intellectual backwaters. The other side of this coin is that the Scottish universities were much more a part of the local community than the English universities. The latter were not responsive to local requirements. While the Scottish universities may have been more democratic than Oxford and Cambridge they still only dealt with the needs of the members of the upper and middle classes.

A final point to note in this summary is that the universities in the south and the north took a different line to each other on the question of the receipt of state support. The two collegiate unions in England studiously avoided the acceptance of state aid. Most of the colleges were well enough endowed to continue their peaceful existence without having to worry about raising money from the state and thus jeopardising their independence. In Scotland none of the universities had ever been able to build up sufficient reserves of wealth to gain any independence from the

state. In fact the accepted practice was for the state to maintain an ongoing commitment to the financial support of the universities. As we observed this practice continued even after the 'state' moved from Edinburgh to London.

Chapter Three

The 1826 Royal Commission on the Scottish Universities, the attempts at legislation in the 1830s and the founding of the University of London

In this chapter an analysis will relate the appointment of a Royal Commission on the Scottish universities, and the subsequent events surrounding the Commissioners report, to events in England. The attempts at legislation on the reform of the Scottish universities will be connected to the breaking of the monopoly of university education in England by the Anglican church by the establishment and eventual chartering of the University of London.

Primary sources will be used to contruct an account of the debate on these innovations. It will be shown that some of the ideas raised in the debate over the reform of the universities in Scotland were also raised in the discussion about the establishment of a university in London. It will be seen that in some cases the same individuals were closely connected with events on both sides of the border. In this chapter we will begin to see that those who wish to understand the reform of the Scottish universities can profit from the study of events taking place outside of Scotland.

This section on the first half of the nineteenth century will indicate that the relationship between the church and the universities was beginning to be questioned on both sides of the Tweed. It will show that the nature of the debate on university matters was closely linked with concerns about the secularization of British society.

As in the subsequent chapter of this thesis the study of university reform in the 1820s and 1830s will be related to the educational ideas associated with the aristocratic, professional and

mercantile classes to see whether the relationships between these three groups was the same in Scotland as it was in England. In particular we need to investigate whether the differences in the relative prestige of these groups on either side of the border had any observable impact on the universities.

In 1826 Robert Peel, in his position as Home Secretary in the Tory administration of the Earl of Liverpool, ordered a Royal Commission to be set up to inquire into the state of the colleges and universities of Scotland. As we have seen in the previous chapter these institutions had built up an international reputation in the later half of the eighteenth century and some of the professors were of world-wide repute. In his article on the differences between the Scottish and English approaches to university education in the nineteenth century Wright maintains that in the 1820s

> 'the Scottish universities enjoyed their highest reputation in the south.'[1]

In many parts of the English-speaking world the universities of Scotland provided a model that was preferred to that of Oxbridge. While the Scottish universities blossomed in the fifty years before 1820 the two English universities became the training schools of the Angican church and the finishing schools for the aristocracy. Green's study of the universities refers to

> 'The stagnation which settled on Oxford and Cambridge in the eighteenth century.'[2]

Yet Robert Peel ordered an inquiry into the Scottish universities rather than into the universities of England. In order to explain this apparent paradox we ought to examine the reasons behind his decision and to compare the situation in the north with that in England.

The 1826 Scottish University Commission

In his history of the University of Glasgow Mackie suggests that Edinburgh University was to blame for the ordering of the Royal Commission. Mackie maintains that

> 'religious and political dissatisfaction formed the background for the Commission of 1826; that Commission was immediately due to a limited and local cause.'

The limited and local cause he refers to was the strained relationship between the Senate of Edinburgh University and the Town Council which still retained some administrative control over the university. For some time the professoriat and the Town Council had been in conflict over their respective areas of responsibility. Mackie tells us that

> 'A series of quarrels came to a climax in a dispute about the chair of Midwifery.'[3]

The question whether midwifery should become a compulsory component for those intending to graduate in medicine excited both the Senate and the Town Council. Both claimed that they had the authority to decide the matter and believed that a point of principle was at stake. The Senate attempted to resolve the dispute by petitioning the government to issue a Royal Commission to enquire into the financial and administrative structure of the university. Mackie thinks Peel responded to this request.

In an article on 'Science and Scottish University Reform' Morrell offers a slightly different perspective on these events when he says

> 'I want to suggest that at the dawn of the so-called

> Age of Reform, the Scottish universities in general and Edinburgh in particular were facing or evading dire problems concerning effective organization and administration.'

This author refers to the Edinburgh dispute and to the question of the possible union of the two universities in Aberdeen with the comment

> 'These untidy arrangements at Edinburgh and Aberdeen, I suspect, did not satisfy Peel who revered administrative efficiency, particularly if it was informed by a strong sense of public duty and accountability.'[4]

A further perspective on these events can also be found in the book by George Davie. Here the author points out that although

> 'Government intervention in the affairs of the Scottish universities, we learn from Sir William Hamilton, had been invoked in view of certain pressing difficulties of finance and administration . . . . it came as something of a shock when the Commissioners at once began to pry into the curriculum and to criticize severely an academic inheritance which still enjoyed a considerable respect on the Continent.'[5]

In spite of the differences in the interpretation between these authors we can note that they share a common viewpoint in that they all search for an explanation for the ordering of the enquiry in events to the north of the border. As a result of the methodology outlined in the first chapter of this study it should be clear that to seek a fuller understanding of these events we need to take account of the circumstances on both sides of the Tweed. By referring to the correspondence of the principal actors involved in the

decision to set up the Royal Commission we may get a more accurate idea of the reasons why it was decided to order a Commission at this time and why it was decided to extend the scope of the enquiry beyond the limits suggested by those requesting the Commission.

It appears from the secondary sources that Joseph Hume was one of the principal actors involved in the events which lead up to the decision to set up the Commission. Hume was a leading political figure of his day even though he never held a cabinet post. His reputation as a radical reformer was acquired as a result of his efforts in getting the repeal of the Combination Acts through parliament in 1824. He sat as the Member of Parliament for the Montrose district; within his constituency were the two universities of Aberdeen. His direct involvement with the Scottish universities arose out of his being elected to the position of Rector of Marischal University in 1825.

The office of Rector was regarded as an honorary one and was usually held by powerful or influential members of the aristocracy. As Hume was none of these things his election caused something of a stir. The students had exercised their right to vote in the election in a way that asserted their independence from the wishes of the professoriat of Marischal University. According to Anderson's account of these elections the Professors tried to use their influence and authority to secure the election of the Earl of Fife. In 1823 they succeeded, but only, if we accept the report of the Aberdeen Chronicle quoted by Anderson, by tampering with the voting slips. But in 1824 Hume was elected by a substantial majority and in the following year was returned with a unanimous vote. Traditionally the Rectorship involved nominal duties, but characteristically Hume decided to exercise the power of holding a Rectorial Court. In his book on the Rectorial Addresses Anderson says the court was called to

> 'inquire into "irregularities and abuses . . . in some departments of the college, prejudical to the interests of the students."[6]

After hearing all the evidence and gaining some idea of the nature of the problems facing the university Hume decided that his powers as Rector were inadequate when it came to bringing about the necessary reforms. Anderson informs us that Hume wrote to one of his student supporters with this news; apparently Hume wrote

> 'expressing the belief that a Royal Visitation alone could effectively alter the system on which the discipline of the college was founded.'

It appears that Hume had already resolved to work towards that end for in that same letter he said

> 'I therefore made the requisite representation to Mr Peel, who with a readiness and candour highly honourable to him, after satisfying himself of the accuracy of my representations, appointed the Commission which is now engaged on that business.'[7]

Although we can verify that Hume did in fact see Peel on this matter it would be a mistake to think that Hume played as an important part as he makes out. Robert Peel, in his position as Home Secretary, was in a much better position to account for the issuing of the Commission. It was the Home Secretaries job to advise the Crown on such matters having first consulted his various advisors. In this matter one of the first persons to consult would have been the Lord Advocate for Scotland, William Rae. In his position was Lord Advocate Rae was expected to advise the Home Secretary on all matters relating to Scotland.

In a letter from Robert Peel to William Rae dated the 5th of December 1825 we can see that Peel did consult Rae. Peel says

> 'I had a very long interview this day with Mr Hume upon the subject of the Scotch (sic) Universities.

> His object in coming to me was to urge the propriety of a visitation, to be exercised on the part of the Crown through the medium of a Commission - into the present state of those universities.
> He states a particular reason for such a visitation (independent of the general advantage which would result from an inquiry into the different systems of education pursued at the Scotch Universities) the dispute which has lately arisen between the Professors and the Patrons of the University of Edinburgh. An application which lately made (sic) from Marischal College of Aberdeen, for a grant of public money, for the repair or reconstruction of the College, and the propriety of considering before such an application were acceded to, whether it might not be advantageous to form some kind of Union between the two Universities at Aberdeen.
> . . . . .
> . . . . .
> My answer to Mr Hume was that the subject was of too much importance for me to express an opinion upon it on the instant - but that I would without delay give it due consideration . . . Now there are certainly some abuses, or at least were at no very remote period, committed by some of the Scotch Universities, which ought to be forthwith corrected - the Medical Profession had been brought into disrepute by the facilities with which some Scotch Universities grant diplomas. . . . .'[8]

Peeel went on to ask for Rae to give his opinion about the value of a visitation and to suggest to Rae that he should talk the matter over with Lord Melville. As 'manager' of Scottish affairs, an unofficial but important post Melville had inherited from his father, Lord Melville was expected to advise the government on matters north of the border and to dispense patronage.

The scandal of the sale of medical degrees applied only to St. Andrews and Aberdeen universities, but nevertheless attracted some attention and damaged the reputation of all the Scottish universities even though the standard of medical education at Edinburgh and Glasgow was far superior to anything in England. However, just a few months before Peel's letter was sent to Rae, The Times report of the proceedings of the House of Commons contained the following:-

> 'Mr. Brougham and Mr. Secretary Croker gave the professors of our two Northern Universities a hearty rap over the knuckles, for their mercenary conduct of selling degrees . . . Mr. Brougham asserts that a man sending £15. to the other side of the Forth "will by the next post receive a diploma to kill and slay His Majesty's liege subjects".[9]

William Rae's reply to Peel's letter contains the opinion that 'a visitation if intrusted to proper hands would prove useful'. He went on to acknowledge that there were various abuses that ought to be corrected and to express the opinion that of the abuses, the sale of medical degrees 'certainly hold the most prominent part'. It is interesting that one 'evil' that troubled Rae was the spread of the practice of the students electing a Rector; the annual election of a Rector was customary at Glasgow University and this idea had slowly been adopted at the other Scottish universities. Rae drew Peel's attention to this but suggested, diplomatically, that this worry 'perhaps ought not to be brought prominently forward'[10] It would obviously been a source of embarrassment if it were thought that a Tory government were only acting to interfere in the election of non-aristrocratic Rectors.

Mackie was certainly right to suggest that the Commission was in part due to the quarrel between the University Senate and the Town Council in Edinburgh but he overstates the importance of that quarrel.

A more balanced interpretation would accept that no one incident provoked the issuing of the Commission, but that it came about as a result of a number of problems none of which, in themselves, were sufficient reason for a Commission. Taken together the Edinburgh quarrel, the medical degrees scandal, the possible union of the Aberdeen universities or the question of the election of Rectors by students convinced Peel and Rae of the desirability of a Royal Commission.

Having said that there is a further point that should be made. At the root of three of these problems lay the question of finance. The Town Council in Edinburgh were in financial difficulties; the two northern universities were condemned to sell medical degrees in order to raise money and the question of the union of the Aberdeen universities would have allowed for certain economies.

Prior to taking any public steps to initiate the issuing of a Royal Commission both Peel and Rae thoroughly investigated the precedents of former visitations. Peel's researches showed that at least three Commissions had been issuing since the Union of the Parliaments in 1707. So when the issuing of the Commission was finally made public nobody questioned the authority of the Crown to order an inquiry into the Scottish universities; unlike their southern counterparts, the Scottish universities openly acknowledged the power of the state to order an inquiry into their internal affairs.

The terms of reference of the Commission covered all the points that Peel and Rae had discussed in their correspondence. Hence the Commission was required to enquire into

> 'all Statutes, Rules, and Ordinances now in force, especially such as relate to the granting of Degrees . . the management and ordering of the Universities . . . . the Rentals and Revenues of the Universities and Colleges, to the Powers, Jurisdiction and

> Privileges of the Chancellors, Vice-Chancellors, Rectors, Deans of Faculty, Professors and all other Members and Office-Bearers . . . to decide all Controversies, Pleas and Disputes arising in regard to the Rules for granting degrees, or any other cause whatever'.[11]

That last little phrase and the instruction to enquire into the 'manner of teaching . . . and as to all things else relating thereto' allowed for a scale of enquiry that came as a surprise to the Scots, as Davie's earlier comment makes clear.

Peel was also responsible for selecting the Commissioners. They needed to be individuals who would be acceptable to the Scots; therefore, Lord Palmerston's suggestion that four Oxbridge academics should be appointed was not acted on.[12] Seventeen Commissioners were named on the 23rd July, 1826, but it was readily apparent that for various reasons some of those appointed would take little or no part in the visitation. It came as no surprise, therefore, when Lord Melville announced to the Commissioners at one of their first meetings that five more persons had been named as Commissioners on the 27th of September, 1826.

The Commissioners were the Duke of Gordon, Chancellor of King's College, Aberdeen; the Duke of Montrose, the Chancellor of Glasgow University; the Marquis of Huntly, Chancellor of Marischal College, Aberdeen; the Earl of Aberdeen, Rector of King's College, Aberdeen; the Earl of Rosebery; the Earl of Mansfield; Viscount Melville, Chancellor of St. Andrews University; Lord Binning, later to become the Earl of Haddington; Charles Hope, President of the College of Justice in Scotland; Sir William Rae, the Lord Advocate; David Boyle, Justice-Clerk of Scotland; Sir Samuel Shepherd, Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer; William Adam, Chief Commissioner of the Jury Court in Scotland; John Hope, Solicitor-General; George Cranstoun, Dean of the Faculty of Advocates; Thomas Taylor, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and George Cook, late Moderator of that same General Assembly.

The five additional Commissioners were the Earl of Lauderdale; Sir Walter Scott, the author; The Rev Dr Lee, a minister to an Edinburgh church; Henry Home Drummond, an advocate and director of the Bank of Scotland, and James Moncreiff, another advocate. Out of these twenty-two individuals twenty were Scots.

Now clearly some of these individuals played a much more prominent part in the conduct of the Commission than others. One method we can use to attempt to identify the most active and influential members is to look at the regularity of their attendance at the Commissions proceedings at Edinburgh. The Duke of Gordon died in 1827 without ever attending a sitting. The Marquis of Huntly, on becoming the fifth Duke of Gordon on the death of his father, attended none of the Edinburgh sittings, but did attend when a Committee of the Commission visited the Universities of Aberdeen five times. The Earl of Montrose, the Earl of Mansfield and William Adam were conspicuous by their total absence from every sitting of the Commission. Sir Walter Scott, for some reason, attended a single meeting of the Commission when it sat in Edinburgh in November 1927, but none thereafter.

Although the Earl of Aberdeen was elected Chairman of the Commission he attended only eight of the ninety-nine sittings. However, John Hope in a letter to Peel implied that he and Aberdeen were mainly responsible for establishing 'the heads of Inquiry' of the Commission. This is in spite of the fact that neither Aberdeen or Hope had attended Scottish universities or had any experience of these institutions. We should not be surprised to read in a letter by Aberdeen to Hope that 'I have been a good deal staggered by some of the evidence, and have been led to reconsider many preconceived notions.'[13] Later in the same letter Aberdeen admits to being ignorant about the various schools in Scotland. The schools and universities of Scotland were clearly unlike Harrow and St John's College Oxford where the Earl of Aberdeen had been educated.

John Hope, the Solicitor-General and deputy to the Lord Advocate, was the most conscientious attender at the meetings of the Commission; he went to ninety-four of the ninety-nine hearings. In his history of the university of Edinburgh, Alexander Grant says that the impression was that Hope was 'one of those who took a leading part in the work of the Commission'.[14]

The fact that Hope was more active than his superior, William Rae, may have been due to the fact that with the replacement of Liverpool's administration by that of George Canning the relationship between Rae and Hope might have altered. Omond, the author of a book on the Scottish Lord Advocates, suggests that Hope was scheming to replace Rae as Lord Advocate.[15]

The next best attender was the Rev. Dr. Lee, who had been made Principal Clerk to the General Assembly in 1827. At one point, in 1832, The Scots Times said it understood that Dr. Lee was the author of the Commissions report, but Dr. Lee's firm denial of that in a letter to the paper and the footnote on page 69 of the Report clearly indicate he was not the author. The footnote reads

> 'Dr. Lee declined subscribing the Report, because it contains many passages which he did not approve and from which he had not found it convenient to enter his dissent at the proper time'.[16]

From later developments we can surmise that Dr. Lee's objections to certain passages in the Report concerned the relationship between the universities and the Church; in particular Dr. Lee was worried lest the education of clerics might be reformed without the approval of the Church of Scotland.

Only six other Commissioners attended more than half of the Edinburgh sittings. These were William Rae; James Moncreiff, who

succeeded Cranstoun as Dean of the Faculty of Advocates; the Earl of Rosebery, who succeeded the Earl of Aberdeen as Chairman of the Commission; the Earl of Haddington; Charles Hope, the father of John Hope and George Cranstoun who had been raised to the bench in 1826 with the title of Lord Corehouse.

It is to this group of eight individuals that we can look to for the tone and temper of the Commission. So far as political allegiances were concerned we find a strong Tory emphasis; only Moncreiff, Cranstoun and Rosebery were there to counter the Tory party/Church alliance. Educationally three of the eight had experience of Oxbridge (Rosebery, Haddington and Moncreiff). Professionally, the dominant group were lawyers; five out of the eight were lawyers, Rosebery and Haddington were politicians and Lee was a cleric. Unaccountably, none of the eight were academics However, Lee became the Principal of Edinburgh University in 1840 and Cranstoun had a reputation as a Greek scholar, but this hardly amounts to much in this context. In fact not one of the twenty-two Commissioners was an academic.

Writing of Glasgow University Mackie's comment on the Commission was that

> 'The fact that in its Report it gave pride of place to Edinburgh may argue a certain attitude of mind'.[17]

Unfortunately Mackie fails to follow up this point. On a purely geographical basis he is quite correct in his statement ; out of the eight Commissioners we have singled out for special attention, five were educated at Edinburgh university while only one went to Glasgow.

The discussion of the significance of this factor can be connected with the point Smout raised as to the differences between the middle classes in the two cities. In the second chapter we referred to a piece by Smout in which he associated Edinburgh with the 'professional classes' and Glasgow with 'the commercial and manufacturing interests' .

So when Mackie points out that the dominance of Edinburgh may be associated with a 'certain attitude of mind' we should be able to deduce that a professional attitude is what is being referred to. Hence we can explicate the point raised by Mackie by emphasising the fact that the Edinburgh-based lawyers were the dominant group on the Commission and that the mercantile class was hardly represented.

At the time of the announcement of the names of the Commissioners the press criticized the list. For example, The Times quoting the Edinburgh Star concluded that 'This is about the most impudently managed business it has been for sometime fallen to our lot to notice.' The paper complained four of the Commissioners were the Chancellors of the colleges they were supposed to investigate and ended by saying

> 'Anything like a thorough exposure of what is wrong either in the constitution or in the practice of our universities we certainly do not expect from them.'[18]

In one way the paper was correct; the four Commissioners contributed little of the enquiry. One of them died in 1826, another failed to attend any of the meetings of the Commission, a third merely attended the meetings of the Committee that had been appointed to sit at the university of which he was Chancellor while the fourth attended seventeen out of the ninety-nine meetings. However we must not assume that these noblemen Chancellors hindered the inquires of the Commission; to do that they would have had to attend at the sittings of the Commission. This links with a point raised by Davie. In the first edition of his book on the Scottish universities he said of the 1826 Commissioners that 'the Commissioners were mostly Scots noblemen'.[19] Now this statement was clearly inaccurate, so in the 1981 edition of the book the above sentence has been modified to read 'the

Commission included many Scots noblemen';[20] by way of explanation of this statement Davie appends a footnote which states

> 'in point of fact, the nobility had only a bare majority on the Commission. Even so it is still true to say that this Commission was aristocratic in its bias, as compared with the Commission of 1858 which stood for the professional standards of the Scottish legal class, or with that of 1876, which took its tone from its English 'progessive' members.'[21]

Whilst noting with interest that in this passage at least Davie refers to the aristocratic, professional and progressive biases it must be remembered that the aristocratic representatives on the Royal Commission of 1826 played a small part in the minuted proceedings.

The analysis of the composition of the Commission which reported in 1831 presented in this thesis differs considerably from that provided by Furniss in his study of 'Internal Colonialism' as it related to higher education in Scotland. With a footnote that refers to 'The Democratic Intellect' Furniss states that the Scottish university Commissions were

> 'established with the express purpose of adapting the Scottish system to the English mould.'[22]

The reader is referred to the whole of Davie's book rather than to any specific pieces of evidence. Later Furniss says

> 'The 1831 Commission failed in its attempt to align the two systems because of the isolation of its membership from a still strong tradition; I found only one of the 13 members having any connection with Scottish universities either as professor, administrator or M.P.'[23]

For our purposes it does not help our checking of Furniss's information that he fails to mention which of the twenty-two Commissioners he looked up to get his information about '13 members'. His figures are clearly wrong and his understanding of Davie's opinion on this early Commission seems to miss the point that it had an aristocratic bias. We would not expect to see them working as 'professors, administrators or M.P.s'. Furniss's selective list of the ways in which Commissioners may have been connected with the Scottish universities fails to note that aristocratic Chancellors of four of the Scottish universities were appointed as Commissioners and that another aristocratic Commission was the Rector of King's College, Aberdeen.

If Peel and the aristocratic members on the Commission had ever seriously considered the idea of imposing English notions of 'liberal education' on their northern neighbours we must conclude that they failed to carry through their plans.

An interpretation of these times which fits more closely with the known facts is that 'Athenian Aberdeen', as the first Chairman of the Commission was sometimes called, found out at an early stage that the educational system in Scotland was very different from what he might have imagined and that it bore little relation to his experience at Harrow and Cambridge. If Aberdeen and Peel had intended to 'anglicise' the Scottish universities we may conjecture that the correspondence between Aberdeen and Hope previously referred to was an indication to the Solicitor-General that the plan would have to be abandoned. It is worth noting that after the first few sittings of the Commission and after Aberdeen had written to Hope that he had had to 'reconsider many preconceived notions', that Aberdeen resigned as Chairman. The corollary of this interpretation of events would be that the aristocratic members of the Commission acknowledged defeat at the hands of the professional interests and kept away from the sittings of the Commission. But if this was indeed the case we should not assume that the aristocratic group were persuaded to abandon their

plan by arguments that centred on educational considerations. It seems much more likely that the Duke of Aberdeen and Robert Peel were influenced by the strength of the public outcry that followed the announcement of the names of the Commissioners. In a letter to Peel from John Hope the Home Secretary was informed that

> 'The selection of the members of the Royal Commission has been vehemently attacked in the most decided party newspaper of Edinburgh in a variety of paragraphs which profess to be particularly interested for your perusal and the objects of the obnoxious writers of course assumed to be defeat all our good intentions in issuing the Commission.'[24]

The Commission was based in Edinburgh and sent small Committees to Glasgow, Aberdeen and St Andrews to collect evidence on local issues. By the end of November 1827 most of the evidence had been collected from witnesses appearing before the Commissioners. A year later an Interim Report was produced on which the universities were invited to comment. The final meetings of the Commission were held in September 1830, but the completed Report was not published until the first month of 1832.

The Report covered a wide range of topics. The Commissioners recommended changes on the constitution of the universities which were intended to deal with the dispute between the Senate and the Town Council in Edinburgh, with the problems arising out of the smallness of St Andrews, with the merging of the two Colleges of Aberdeen into a single university and with the disputes within the professoriate in Glasgow about the administration of university affairs.

The Commissioners put forward the plan that each university should be presided over by a Chancellor appointed by the Crown and that there should be a university Court in which the 'general Superintendence and Government of the University . . . should be

vested.' Although the Commissioners recommendations on the University Courts reflected a respect for local conditions it was clear that the general intention was to introduce a common constitutional structure for the universities of Scotland. On the constitutional side it was the proposal about the extension of a system of visitation which was to cause most controversy. The Commissioners were persuaded that another Board of Visitors should be appointed

> 'to superintend the execution of the Regulations, to be approved of by the King, in the Report of the present Commissioners, and to modify or extend such Regulations, subject to the sanction of His Majestry, as circumstances may appear to require.' [25]

In the middle of the 1830s these recommendations were to become the subject of bitter dispute.

The Commissioners next turned to the consideration of the course of study followed in the different branches of knowledge taught in these universities. While acknowledging that the Scottish universities catered for a variety of students, some of whom were not interested in gaining any formal qualifications, the Commissioners proposed that the arrangements for a degree structure ought to follow the plan for the curriculum in the Faculty of Arts which was organized on the basis of four years study. They proposed that

> 'the first year . . . should include the first Latin and first Greek classes . . . the second year . . . should include the second Latin, second Greek, and first Mathematical classes . . . the third year . . . should include a second Mathematical class, and a class of Elementary Logic and Rhetoric . . . the fourth year . . . should include the classes of Natural Philosophy and Moral Philosophy . . .' [26]

Two of the churchmen on the Commission dissented from the majority report on these recommendations and said they were

> 'convinced that if this curriculum be sanctioned by His Majesty a much greater proportion of the time spent at College will be engrossed with the Classics than from the necessary state of classical literature in Scotland, where it leads to little advancement and little emolument would be advantageous, while the cultivation of the intellectual and reasoning powers will be too long delayed.'[27]

Davie focuses some attention on these detailed proposals and concludes that

> 'the Commissioners plainly recommended nothing short of a sharp break with Scottish educational tradition, and their proposals accordingly excited little sympathy. Patriotic Scots were suspicious of innovations modelled on the practices of the 'auld enemy'. . .'[28]

Davie clearly thinks that the clash between the classics and philosophy was part of an ideological debate that arose out of the variation in the educational ideas of the Scots and the English. While this may have been the underlying reason for the dissenting report by Taylor and Cook we ought to take account of their words in the alternative proposal. They said that the study of classics was inappropriate in Scotland because it 'leads to little advancement and little emolument.'[29] As a statement of fact this was undoubtedly true, the Scots did not possess the sort of jobs or sinecures into which they could place embodiments of the gentlemanly ideal.

Ideally the Commissioners would have liked to have seen the courses for those preparing for entry into the professions of law, medicine and divinity follow on from the compulsory Arts course. With regard to professional training it was this notion that

attracted most attention. The Commissioners made detailed proposals for the courses in each of these areas; the universities were more concerned with the notion of preliminary qualifications for entry onto these courses than with criticizing the graduation schemes.

The Commissioners recommendation on entry qualifications to the courses of professional study touched upon the question of free entry into the universities. As Davie notes

> 'these innovations, despite the favour shown to them by the highest authorities, were strenuously resisted by traditional Scots, as on the one hand likely to restrict the free entry into the University which was such a source of national pride and, on the other hand, likely to divert the path of Scottish education into those specialised channel, which were not congenial to the native genius.'[30]

On the next page of his chapter on these events Davie draws out the interesting point that

> 'the final report touched on the issue between liberal and utilitaririan education . . . it was the aristocratic majority who dragged in this clear-cut antithesis . . .'[31]

It must be agreed that Davie is substantially correct in identifying an 'anglicizing' influence in the Commission. But this does not mean he is correct in connecting his specific allegations with power of the aristocracy to influence the decisions of the Commissioners. As Anderson notes

> 'The Commissions preference for the classics was no doubt an example of Anglicization, but its roots lay in the professional aspirations of the Edinburgh lawyers who formed the Commissions majority.'[32]

The Scotsman gave the Report a reserved welcome in saying

> 'the Commissioners seem to have executed the important and delicate duties assigned to them able, carefully and independently . . .'[33]

However a week after this welcoming account The Scotsman had developed a line of criticism of the recommendations which drew attention to the proposal that all office-holders in the universities should have to subscribe to the Confession of Faith. This requirement had gradually declined in Scotland even though the two English universities still insisted that everyboby in the universities should take a similar oath, even the students.

Only fourteen of the twenty-two Commissioners signed the Final Report. Statistically it seems rather odd that seven of that number could dissent from what was still called the Majority Report. The minority were concerned about the resolution which declared that it was not expedient that Professors should also be a Minister of a parish. Out of this minority group the Earl of Haddington further dissented by insisting on the counter proposal that rather than excluding active clergymen from the Chairs of Theology that those Chairs should only be held by those 'in active connection with the church.'[34]

But these matters must be seen as relatively minor points. The dissenting Commissioners did not touch on the topics that Davie is most concerned with. The Report did not indicate that an English approach to the university curriculum had been adopted. In the absence of clear evidence that the Commissioners differed over the basics we must assume that the professional ideas long associated with the Scottish universities were not being questioned to any great extent. It appears that the aristocratic and mercantile classes were not able to impose their ideas on the Scottish universities.

Attempts at legislation on the Scottish Universities in the 1830s

When the Final Report of the Commissioners was published in January 1832 the Westminster parliament was deeply involved in the attempt by the Whig administration of Earl Grey to introduce legislation aimed at extending the franchise to all those who satisfied the £10 household qualification. The changes proposed also involved the alteration of the constituencies to reflect the process of urbanization that had been going on since the end of the last century.

Although the pressure for reform of the electoral system arose out of a recognition of the growing importance of the middle classes most commentators insist that the changes brought about by the passage of the Act in June 1832 were symbolic rather than practical. In his study of 'The Making of Victorian England', for example, Kitson Clark maintains that

> 'the middle class, however defined, . . . were deemed to be politically important at the time of that Reform Bill, and that Bill was proposed and passed largely as a recognition of their importance; but after the Bill the final control in politics still lay without question in the hands of the old governing classes, the nobility and gentry.'[35]

Although the Report of the Scottish Universities Commission was published at a time of a wave of reform it was not immediately taken up by the incoming Whig ministry. Anderson thinks that the recommendations of the Commissioners were not acted upon partly because Scottish affairs had a low priority in parliament and partly because the Scottish M.P.s did not present a common front on the matter.

Others take a slightly different view. Horn sees matters in a light that has a more directly political context. He says

> 'Unfortunately, by the time the Commissioners report was published the Whigs and Radicals had taken over from the reforming Tories. They were intent on bigger game than the reform of the Scottish Universities and not much inclined to spend parliamentary time on what they regarded as the timid and compromising plans of their Tory predecessors . . . '[36]

Morrell's comments on the position offer yet another view. He says

> 'Compared with such issues as the abolition of slavery (1833), working conditions in factories (1833), and the amendment of the Poor Law (1834) reform of the Scottish Universities seemed merely local: accordingly the 1830 Report . . . was shelved.'[37]

Whatever the reasons little was done. In May 1833 The Times reported that the Earl of Haddington had asked the Home Secretary, Lord Melbourne, 'whether anything had been determined by His Majesty's government in consequence of reports of the Commission on the Scotch Universities?' In his parliamentary reply Lord Melbourne noted that the reports embraced 'great changes' and that no measure had yet been taken. He continued 'However, it was the intention of government to take the matter into consideration as speedily as possible.'[38] The Earl of Haddington no doubt gained the impression that nothing was going to be done. He was quite right.

In 1834 the Tories were temporarily in power, but had no time to take any steps on the Report. In 1835 Lord Melbourne was promoted to Prime Minister and still nothing was done; officially at least.

However, action was taken by three M.Ps. who had joined the House of Commons since the passing of the 1832 electoral reforms.

The first initiative was taken by Alexander Bannerman, a merchant who represented Aberdeen from 1832 till he retired in 1847. Bannerman was a man of Whig principles. In 1835 he presented a private members Bill which proposed the union of the two universities of Aberdeen.

On the west coast of Scotland, moves were also afoot to introduce a bill with specific regard to the university of Glasgow. Again the initiative was taken by two M.Ps. with commercial backgrounds. James Oswald was a merchant in Glasgow, while Colin Dunlop was head of the Clyde Iron Works.

In his paper on the chemist and university reformer Thomas Thomson, Morrell describes Oswald and Dunlop as 'stern advocates of liberal reform'[39] and relates how they awaited the reaction to the second reading of Bannerman's bill on Aberdeen before deciding what to do about the Glasgow bill. There seems to have been some confusion as to the role played by Lord Melbourne in these activities.

In its report of the proceedings of parliament The Times said that Lord Melbourne had commented that the Aberdeen bill was not sanctioned by Ministers and had been

> 'introduced by an individual member of the House of Commons without the knowledge of government'.

On seeing this account Bannerman immediately wrote to the Editor of The Times to protest that their reporter must have misunderstood the speech by Lord Melbourne, as

> 'I have more than once im my place in the House of Commons, and elsewhere stated that I did introduce this measure with the sanction and consent of His Majesty's Government'.[40]

It seems likely that Lord Melbourne was attempting to gauge the strength of the opposition to the proposals contained in Bannerman's bill without the government becoming committed to any specific cause of action. Morrell simply thinks that Bannerman, Oswald and Dunlop all 'placed excessive faith in Lord Melbourne, the Prime Minister, who was indifferent to both issues'[41]

On the 6th of July, 1835 Bannermen moved the second reading of his Bill in the House of Commons. He described his bill as being of the 'utmost importance, which aimed at affording facilities for the advancement of learning in Scotland, by the consolidation of the two Universities of Aberdeen'. Sir Robert Peel suggested that in order to allow time for consideration and 'instead of risking an angry discussion in the present Session, the hon. Member for Aberdeen had better postpone the Measure'[42] The Bill was read for a second time.

Later the same month Bannerman was forced to acknowledge to his fellow Members of Parliament that they 'should be besieged with papers, protests and petitions against this Bill'. Under pressure from Peel, who felt that local opinion should be consulted before pressing on with legislation, Bannerman agreed to the postponement of his Bill when it was requested by the opposition. In the light of these developments Oswald was also forced to agree with the postponement of the Glasgow Bill at the same time.

In reporting the postponement of these Bills the Scotsman commented

> 'We suspect the time is not yet come for reforming these Seminaries. Any effectual reform must touch the wordly interests or hurt the pride of a number of persons, who open in full cry against the author of the measure, while the general public, from ignorance or apathy, give him no support . . . .'[43]

With regard to the opposition to the Aberdeen Bill, Rait thinks

that the focus of opposition can be centred on King's College. He says

> 'King's College used its Parliamentary influence against the scheme, which did not receive full support from Marischal College . . . The agitation in Aberdeen did not die away on the withdrawal of the Bill, and, in the course of discussion, it was actually proposed to remove King's College to Inverness'.[44]

The opponents of the legislation were right not to relax their efforts. By October, 1835 the Home Secretary in Melbourne's government Lord John Russell, had directed the Lord Advocate 'to take measure for preparing Bills for next Parliament to carry the recommendations of the Commissioners with regard to the Scotch Universities into effect'.[45]

In the spring of 1836 notice of the Lord Advocate's Bill was given to the House of Commons, but on the 30th of March the notice was withdrawn without explanation.

Writing about the government's handling of the 1836 Bill, Morrell says

> 'the Whig government handled the Bill in dilatory fashion: not only was its introduction postponed from 30th March 1836, but the secrecy surrounding its details aroused suspicion in England as well as in Scotland'.[46]

For example, in the Aberdeen University Magazine of 21st June, 1836, remarks were made about as to the 'tactics of rather a remarkable description' which were adopted in the introduction of the bill. The report goes on to point out that only after the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland had adjourned was the measure introduced and thence

> 'the bill was instantly introduced, as if the coast were now cleared of a troublesome adversary'.[47]

As to the English reaction to the handling of the bill, Morrell draws attention to the editorial comments which appeared in The Times on the 2nd of April 1836. The Lord Advocate's, John Murray, withdrawal of the notice of the Bill brought down on his head the thunder of The Thunderer. The paper published a long leading article about the Scottish universities legislation which contained pointed remarks which seems to have the sole purpose of holding Murray up to ridicule. The article surmised that he wished

> 'to remodel the Universities of Scotland and to divorce them from that alliance with religion which such novices as Knox, Buchanan and Melville conceived to be their highest glory'.[48]

The tone of this Leading Article gives a hint as to the strength of feeling engendered in the debate as to the role of the church in the institutions of higher education. The Times is correct to note the trend towards the secularization of these institutions. The role of the Church in a society which was undergoing rapid change was an important question in the ten year conflict which culminated in the Distruption of 1843. This conflict over the relationship between the Church and the State was not peculiar to Scotland. As Ferguson maintains

> 'The Ten Years Conflict . . . was not, as it is sometimes made to appear, just an example of the supposed Scottish passion for minute controversy over abstruse principles. The whole place of the church in modern society was what was being contended for, and it raised serious questions about the constitution and the powers of the state'.[49]

The Church's involvement in the debate about the legislation on the Scottish universities was more readily apparent in the reaction of the Bill that Lord Melbourne introduced into the House of Lords just a few weeks after the Lord Advocate had withdrawn his Bill from the House of Commons.

The Earl of Aberdeen quickly became involved in the passage of Lord Melbourne's Bill. In June he wrote to John Hope, who was by then the Dean of the Faculty of Advocates, to say

> 'You will probably have seen the Universities Bill . . . . It is stringent; but I presume that we ought to uphold the recommendating of our report and it is upon these that the whole measure is professed to be founded'.[50]

The fact that the Earl of Aberdeen, a lifelong Tory, should choose to support a Whig Bill which he knew would be strongly opposed was surprising. The way in which Aberdeen was allowed, by Melbourne, to introduce important amendments at the Committee stage of the Bill was also surprising. When the Scotsman commented on the Bill it said that the Earl of Aberdeen had taken the Bill 'under his patronage'.[51] These happenings could be interpreted to mean that Lord Melbourne had recognized that he was not going to be able to force the Bill through in the face of the opposition that he knew was being organized against it. Therefore he secured the valuable support of the Earl of Aberdeen on the condition that Aberdeen was allowed to amend the Bill in certain respects.

The most important amendment introduced by the Earl of Aberdeen concerned the relationship of the Church with the universities. In Aberdeen's words the particular clause in question was

> 'for the purpose of preserving to the established Church of Scotland all the rights, privileges, control and superintendence, which any of its

> Courts now exercise, or can lawfully claim
> to exercise, over the universities.'

This clause was intended to allay the fears of those Petitioners who feared that the government intended to appoint individuals to the Boards of Visitors who might be antagonistic to the established Church of Scotland. In his speech to the House of Lords on his amendment, the Earl of Aberdeen said the Petitioners

> 'seemed to expect that the Universities would be
> placed under the control of persons who might be
> Dissenters, men of any religion, or animated with
> the most hostile spirit towards these institutions.'[52]

Bannerman's reaction to this amendment indicates that he thought that if the amended Bill were to pass through both Houses it would do the opposite to what had been intended. Rather than correcting the abuses that had arisen over the years this clause would allow those abuses to be protected. In a letter to the Lord Advocate Bannerman suggested

> 'After the division in the Peers the other
> evening on the Kirk Clause (all the other
> amendments were harmless) I don't think it fair
> to give Lord Melbourne more trouble and I
> think his Lordship may withdraw the Bill . . .'[53]

While it is clear that the opposition to the original Bill centred on doubts about the composition of the Boards of Visitors, there appears to be some confusion as to the exact nature of the fears of the objectors. Davie states, in the first place, that

> 'From the outset of the debate it is clear that
> the Scots were above all alarmed lest the
> Visitation Committee should contain members
> unsympathetic to the Northern academic traditions.'

At a later point Davie states more boldly that 'there seems little doubt that Scottish national pride inspired the opposition'. In his attempt to set Scotland against England Davie selects a quotation from a speech by Lord Melbourne and surrounds it with his own interpretive veneer. Melbourne was replying to the Earl of Aberdeen's speech on the Scottish Universities Bill and Davie says

> 'the Prime Minister, Melbourne, in replying, did not attempt to dispute the charge that there was strong opposition to the measure in Scotland. Instead, he declared very impatiently that, no matter what any government did for Scotland, a great deal of dissatisfaction could always be expected from that quarter 'in view of the bitter animosities of politics, the bitter differences of religion, the illiberal feelings towards one another, the hatred and ill-opinion of everybody opposed to them 'for which the Scots were so noted'.[54]

If we leave out Davie's comments and instead extend the quotation to give a more accurate feel of the context of Melbourne's remarks, then it can be seen that Melbourne was expressing a frustration that was more general than a narrow impatience with the Scots. He was talking about the efforts he would make to be fair in his selection of the Boards of Visitors; he was, then reported as saying

> 'although it was his intention to exercise that power duly and rightly, he could not undertake to exercise it satisfactorily, because he knew too well the bitter animosities of politics, the bitter differences of religion, the illiberal feeling towards one another, the hatred and ill-opinion of everybody opposed to them, that prevailed unfortunately at the present day in

> every part of his Majesty's dominions, and not in the least in that part of the country to which this measure related, to anticipate any such result'.[55]

This is, surely, an expression of fact rather than an indication of a feeling that exclusively concerned the Scots. The whole of Britain was in a state of ferment and the lead up to the Disruption was Scotlands peculiar manifestation of that ferment. It was the Age of Reform and as Ferguson notes neither Whig nor Tory fully understood the age.

> 'in the period between 1832 and 1867 the two parties were largely at the mercy of conditions that were frequently beyond their comprehension and of events that were beyond their control'.[56]

In his analysis of the happenings of 1836 Davie gives the impression that the main issue at stake was the place of philosophy in the curriculum of the Scottish Universities. He says

> 'A particular object of Scottish fears was the possibility of interference with the philosophical bias traditional to the system, and it would even seem that there was a dread of the Benthamite pressure-group and of the German-Coleridgean pressure-group which about this - 1836 - were becoming powerful in London'.[57]

When setting the scene for his description of the debate that took place in the House of Lords, Davie maintains that

> 'the precise point at issue was that raised by the minority report, signed by the two Church representatives, which, as we have seen, recommended strongly the retention of the traditional philosophical bias of the curriculum

> as being good in itself and suitable to social conditions in the North.'[58]

While this might well have been the main issue for that small group of Scottish academics to whom Davie gives the bulk of his attention it clearly was not the main issue for the Petitioners whose actions provide the most visible evidence of the opposition to the measure.

The concern of these Petitioners centred on the place of the established Church of Scotland in the reformed universities. The Scotsman commented that

> 'From the moment that Lord Aberdeen patronized the Scotch Universities Bill, the outcries and protestations of the Presbyteries ceased . . . We have not the slightest doubt that Lords Haddington and Aberdeen, who so kindly took charge of the Bill, have been in correspondence with a certain Rev Principal, who has rung his bell, and hushed the storm, which he had previously raised. The bill, in its altered form, should be denounced as a nuisance by every independent man.'[59]

Even though the Scotsman took more interest in educational matters than many other contemporary papers it seems unlikely that it would give such extensive coverage to an esoteric academic debate on the role of philosophy in the curriculum of the universities of Scotland. It seems more likely that the paper was presenting the debate to the Scottish people because it touched upon the much wider question of the role of the established Church in Scotland. The Earl of Aberdeen's amendment to the Universities (Scotland) Bill was, after all, not concerned with the place of philosophy on the curriculum. And

the letter written by Bannerman to the Lord Advocate clearly and unambigiously referred to the 'kirk clause'.

Support for this interpretation of the events surrounding the reasons for the opposition to the legislation on the Scottish universities can be found in the article written on education in Scotland in the 1830s by Withrington. In a footnote the author says of the Bannerman and Oswald bills that

> 'These reforming proposals contained clauses which effectively would have excluded the Established Church from any responsibility for and from most of its influence in the universities, even over appointments in divinity. The cry 'the Church in danger' went up, and the Church-Evangelicals went furiously to work to see that the bills failed: and it was the religious implications of the reforms, not the proposal for changes in curricula or teaching or in large part in administration, which caused the furore.'[60]

So although we can note that the mercantile interests made their first appearance on the stage of university reform, in the persons of Bannerman and Oswald, we must acknowledge that they were not the leading players. In the ten years prior to the Disruption of 1843 the differences between the classes in Scottish society were mainly differences of religion. Although these religious differences also had a social and cultural context we must remind ourselves that at this point of time the religious aspects were of central significance.

One of the advantages of an analysis that deals with a long time scale is that short-term phenomena, such as the Disruption, do not completely distort the picture. Although the impact of the mercantile interest was minimal it is important to note that they were involved.

On the 1st of August, 1836 Hansard's report of the proceedings of the House of Lords shows that Lord Melbourne agreed with the Duke of Wellington to the postponement of the Bill to the next session. However, Melbourne took the precaution of reserving to the government

> 'the power of taking any measure which they might think necessary for the purpose of carrying into effect the recommendation contained in Report of the Commissioners'.[61]

Even though their efforts to pass this legislation had been blocked by the House of Lords, the Whigs still intended to carry out the reforms. Bannerman gives an indication of the strength of feeling stirred by this issue when he writes to the Lord Advocate that

> 'I am clearly of opinion these Professors and Clergy in the North ought to be punished, nothing will annoy them half so much as a Commission'.[62]

By the 5th of September, 1836 Lord John Russell, the Home Secretary, was recruiting individuals to sit on the new Commissions. In November a Commission was appointed to visit the University of Glasgow and another was issued to enquire into the Universities of King's College and Marischal College, Aberdeen. Four years later a further Commission was appointed to visit the University of St. Andrews.

Coutts, the writer of the history of the University of Glasgow, suggests that

> 'The Government seem to have appointed the Commission in the vain hope that they would settle the question of University Reform without requiring Parliament to pass an Act; but the Commissioners found the task too formidable for them . . . '[63]

Having recognized that the main opposition to the 1830s legislation came from those who feared for the position of the established Church in Scottish society we should not lose sight of the fact that opponents of reform can be seen to come from one of the analytical groups previously identified. The clerics who were the main instigators of the opposition to the Bills introduced by Bannerman and Oswald formed a significant section of the professional class.

So in terms of the three-fold classification of society we can conclude that the 1820s and 1830s attempts at reform of the universities of Scotland failed because the reformers were unable to overcome the opposition coming from the clerical and legal professions. Both these professional groups feared that the reforms would loosen their grip on the Scottish universities. The remnants of the Scottish aristocratic class had little impact on the debate because their association with English values and standards made the bulk of the Scottish nation unsympathetic to their aims.

Now if this interpretation of events is correct we must look to the mercantile class as the only remaining group interested in reform. If we begin to analysis Scottish society in terms of the differences between the three classes we must begin to have grave doubts about Davie's ideas on the solidarity of Scottish cultural life. In his study of Edinburgh society and its support for the phrenology movement Shapin does just that when he says

> 'While the Edinburgh cultural elite might elaborate a philosophy which was dependent upon social solidarity and which aimed at preserving it, other sectors of that society believed that solidarity and communality of interests no longer existed. In this way, the 'democratic intellect' of the Scottish universities could be seen, from the outside, as patronisingly elitist and fundamentally flawed. It

> should not be surprising therefore that the cry for the reform of the universities in the 1820s and 1830s came not from 'Anglicising Scots' as Davie would have it, but from the same emergent mercantile classes which supported phrenology.'[64]

Earlier in that same article Shapin had described the relationship of the new mercantile class with the other groups in Scottish society in graphic terms when he maintained that

> 'As the gentry, lawyers and professionals physically transported themselves across the North Loch to live in the gracious New Town, social distance separating the classes became more noticable and, seemingly, less supportable. The mercantile middle-classes began to reject the social privileges of Edinburgh's aristocratic and professional elite . . . . By 1817 the emergent middle-classes had their own newspaper and organ for social, cultural and political comment - The Scotsman - which was critical of The Times, the University, the Established Church and what it saw as intellectual obscurantism.'[65]

The emergent mercantile class had suddenly found itself capable of having a say in the political arena. Following the 1832 Reform Act individuals who would previously have only been elected if supported by a patron found themselves swept into parliament on the vote of those who had been enfranchised by the new regulations. Oswald, Dunlop and Bannerman were just three members of the mercantile class who were elected to seats in the newly constituted House of Commons.

If the interpretation of events offered here is well-grounded the attempt by the aristocratic interest to reform the Scottish universities

failed at the first fence. The professional classes successfully resisted the efforts of the aristocratic class in the 1820s and went on to foil the attempt by the mercantile class to influence events surrounding the Scottish universities in the 1830s.

A certain confusion arises out of Davie's discussion of the reforms of the universities of Scotland in so far as he contrasts the Scottish and English university curriculum on the basis of the differences in their approach to the arts curriculum. By adopting this approach Davie has fallen into the trap of fighting his battle on the ground chosen by his opponents. Instead of noting the contrast between the two university systems that arise out of the fact that the Scottish universities catered for the professional class while the English universities catered for the aristocracy Davie tries to argue that Scottish 'liberal education' provided in the philosophically-based arts curriculum that was more 'liberal' than the arts curriculum at Oxford and Cambridge.

In summary, we should emphasis the fact that although the first 'attack' on the Scottish universities failed it did so because the Scottish social and cultural life was thrown into disarray by the events which were to culminate in the Disruption of 1843. Although we may note the inputs of the aristocratic, professional and mercantile interests to the debate over the reform of the Scottish universities we are forced to acknowledge that the picture is blurred. The social and political divisions in Scottish society were overlaid with a religious veneer that significantly effected the educational debate.

However, we should not despair because what may appear blurred from one perspective can be brought into focus by altering the vantage point. In order to clarify the relationship between the classes, the Church and the universities in this period we ought to turn our attention to the question of the changes taking place in university matters in England.

The foundation of the University of London

Up to the third decade of the nineteenth century the two medieval foundations of Oxford and Cambridge had managed to retain a complete monopoly of university education in England. However, both institutions continued to impose 'tests' which severely restricted certain non-conformists from graduating from these universities. These tests involved the taking of oaths which were intended to establish that graduates, and even undergraduates at Oxford, belonged to the Church of England. The continued application of these tests meant that Jews, Catholics, and in effect, all non-conformists had to travel to the Continent or to Scotland in order to have the opportunity to graduate from a university. To cater for the needs of those who could not afford to travel several academies were established in the eighteenth century to cater for Dissenters. These 'dissenting academies' provided courses which in some cases 'compared favourably with the instruction given at Oxford and Cambridge' according to Green. Over a period of time these institutions developed a curriculum to suit the needs of those entering their doors; this curriculum was much wider than that offered at the two ancient Universities. However these 'dissenting academies' failed to maintain their standards; Green says that

> 'By the early nineteenth century . . . these academies were deteriorating into sectarian theological colleges'.[66]

With the continued failure of Oxford and Cambridge to remove the tests it became obvious that some long-term alternative form of university-level education was required.

Hence in the 1820s a diverse group of individuals, of various political and religious persuasions, came together to found a university that would break the Anglican monopoly of university education in England and begin to

cater for those large sections of English society that were excluded from Oxford and Cambridge.

In the early days of this initiative two distinct groups came together to form an alliance - Non-conformists and Radicals. This alliance was strengthened when the leaders of the Whig party joined in the campaign for the foundation of a new university. Some indication of the nature of the diversity found in this alliance can be gleaned from the fact that Isaac Goldsmid, a Jewish stockbroker of German extraction sat round the same table with Joseph Hume, the Radical politican involved with the affairs of Aberdeen University, and with Henry Brougham, a leading Whig politican of Scottish birth.

These individuals and their associates wished to see the new university established in London where it could attract a clientele quite unlike that catered for by Oxford and Cambridge. This group planned to do away with the religious tests that were imposed by the two older universities and they intended to extend the traditional university curriculum so as to cater for the needs of a much wider class of students than were interested in going to the Anglican colleges at Oxbridge.

The breadth of the support of the initiative was to lead to certain problems. While some groups wanted to exclude the study of theology from the curriculum others wished to develop a course that provided a comparative study of religion in which Anglican ideas could be located. After some argument it was agreed, as Bellot indicates in his quotation from The Times, that

> 'The university was based upon the principle that there were not to be "any religious tests, or doctrinal forms, which would oppose a barrier to the education of any sect among His Majesty's subjects", and the Dissenters were persuaded to recognize that it was 'Utterly impossible to teach theology in a university intended to comprehend persons of all sects.'
>
> 67

Between the time when the proposals to open a university in London were first brought to the attention of the public, in 1825, and October 1826 when the 'university' first opened its doors to students vigorous attempts were made to try to persuade the government to issue a charter to invest the new institution with the authority and prestige in the eyes of the public that it might otherwise lack. It was also intended that a charter would be framed in such a way as to bestow on the fledgeling institution certain practical privileges that pertained to existing universities.

According to Bellot's interpretation, the opposition of the medical profession united liberal and conservative opinion,

> 'The ground of offence was the proposal to single out for elevation to the dignity of a degree-giving body, a school which was new, in no way, it was alleged, superior to many others, and in some respects inappropriately constituted'.[68]

The Medical professions objections were specific and did not go so far as to condemn the whole of the institution in Gower Street; but the objections raised by the universities of Oxford and Cambridge did just that.

The critics of the new institution soon began to call it the 'Godless College of Gower Street' and this phrase identifies the grounds on which the two ancient universities objected to their new competitor. Again Bellot fills in the detail

> 'Wetherell, on behalf of the University of Oxford argued first that the King could not legally incorporate a university in England other than such as should conform with the doctrines, discipline and worship, of the Church of England, since "the regulation and government of a University is . . . . matter ecclesiastical . . . . ";

> and secondly, that to incorporate a university upon the principle and for the purpose that it should not so conform would be in breach of various statutes and laws of the realm'.[69]

Although the objectors were successful in preventing the granting of a Charter to the 'university of London' they failed to prevent the college opening and flourishing.

When this fact was recognised the Anglican community resolved to act by establishing its own college in London in opposition to the Gower Street institution. In June, 1828 a inaugural meeting was held in Freemason's Hall to make public the intention of establishing an Anglican college, which was to be called King's College, and to raise subscriptions. Dr. D'Oyly, the rector of Lambeth and the mainspring of this initiative, had previously made great strides towards assuring the projects successful conclusion by securing the support of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Robert Peel, who in turn persuaded the Prime Minister, the Duke of Wellington, to support the scheme.

According to Hearnshaw the meeting 'proved to be a spectacular success' and supporters, such as Peel and the Earl of Aberdeen, not only offered their political support for the project, but also 'promised large subscriptions'.[70] A provisional committee was set up which, although being disappointed in not securing special permission to build in Regents Park, found a suitable site for the college in the Strand. Within eighteen months of the inaugural meeting King's College had succeeded in obtaining a Charter; this was while the Gower Street institution was still unable to achieve that aim.[71] 'In October, 1831 . . . . the college opened its portals to the world', as Hearnshaw has it, so long as those who entered those portals were willing to submit to the religious tests that were required.

In the imposition of tests King's College was like the two ancient universities, but in other respects it had more in common with the other London colleges. Armytage suggests that

> 'it agreed with the 'godless' institution in Gower Street in three important particulars. The first was the construction put upon the term 'university', as a place where universal or general knowledge was to be taught . . . . The second was a recognition of the needs of the time, that to sustain the foundation 'specific preparation for the particular professions' had to be undertaken . . . The third was its frank recognition of the importance of physical science'.[72]

In Armytage's view 'with such common ground between them, combination was almost inevitable'. However the continued opposition from Anglicans meant that the Whig administration had to struggle for another three years before a compromise was reached. During that time the determination of the Church of England to retain their monopoly over university education was evidenced in the proceedings of Parliament. A bill was passed through the House of Commons, with a large majority, granting Dissenters the right to graduate from both Oxford and Cambridge. But in August 1834 the House of Lords rejected this measure. Sir Robert Peel and W.E. Gladstone both opposed the bill in the Commons debate. Gladstone was to play an important role in the reform of the ancient universities in the 1850s. In the 1834 debate on the question of Dissenters he explained his opposition to the reform by arguing that

> 'the universities are undoubtedly national institutions, but only in so far as they are connected with the national church'.[73]

In making this point Gladstone was speaking for all those who feared that the rise in radical politics might lead to a rapid secularization of the state.

Later in 1834 Lord Melbourne persuaded the supporters of the Gower Street institution to agree to a charter which contained a clause precluding them from granting degrees in medicine and divinity. On the basis of this agreement the opposition of the medical school was removed. In Bellot's words this

> 'left the issue one between the university upon the one hand and Oxford andCambridge upon the other'.[74]

In November 1836 a final compromise was reached; a charter was eventually granted to the University of London; however this university was not the institution in Gower Street. It was a newly conceived institution which incorporated both the Gower Street and Strand institutions and which dealt with the question of medical education by opening the way for the medical schools to be incorporated as well. Bellot explains

> 'What had hitherto been the university became University College, London. Immediately afterwards, upon the same day, was sealed the charter of the new University of London . . . . The charter . . . . established a body . . . . empowered to grant degrees in Arts, Laws and Medicine, after examination, to candidates holding certificates of having completed a course of instruction at University College, King's College, and such other institutions as might hereafter be approved for the purpose'.[75]

In some respects it might be correct to point to the passing of the Reform Act as the turning point in the relationship between the emerging new University of London and the government, but this would push into the background other significant variables which ought to be taken account of. Admittedly, the extension of the franchise in 1832 gave some political power to the emerging middle classes, who were to benefit most from the establishment of a universityin London, but account must be taken of the changes taking place in the relationship between the church and the

universities. One way in which the comings and goings over the establishment of the University of London can be explained is to say that the church's monopoly of control over the universities was under attack. In the period leading up to the Reform Act of 1832 the attack had been from those who had no connection with the state, but after the reforms the new government needed the support of those pressing for educational reform of the universities and, thus the attackers found that they had some political pull.

So the period before 1832 can be described by Archer and Vaughan in these terms

> 'During the first thirty years of the century, Tory rule, accompanied by an intimate association between church and state, and loyally supported by the universities, precluded the possibility of reform in higher education. In fact the universities were part of the political establishment: 'the university of Oxford had long since ceased to exist except for the purpose of electioneering', claimed the Westminster Review'.[76]

The end of the 'intimate association' between church and state was evidenced in the passing of the 1832 Reform Act and in the clash within the Tory party over the question of Catholic emancipation. To many Torys the idea that the Catholics of Ireland should be emancipated was seen as the thin end of the wedgethat would lead to the disestablishment of the Anglican church in England.

The fact that the universities were so closely connected with the church involved them in this question. For example, a dramatic indication of the linkage between the question of catholic emancipation and the establishment of the university of London is given in Norman Gash's biography of Robert Peel. In that biography Gash relates how

> Lord Winchilsea charged Wellington with having previously supported the foundation of the new Anglican College in London - King's College - as 'a blind to the Protestant and High Church party', so that under the cloak of outward zeal he could carry out his design for 'the infringement of our liberties and the introduction of Popery in every department of the state'.[77]

Gash proceeds to relate how the Duke of Wellington was forced to counter such fears by fighting a dual with Winchilsea.

Another indication of the fears engendered by the change in the political climate in the early 1830s is provided by Green in his description of the factors surrounding the establishment of the other only university in Britain in this period. Green maintains that

> 'The chapter of Durham Cathedral seemed to many to be so scandalously wealthy that a majority of the canons became convinced that they could only prevent the diversion of their resources by the ecclesiastical reformers through sponsoring the foundation of a college'.

Green supports this hypothesis by quoting from a letter sent by the prebendary of Durham to Archdeacon Thorp in July 1831 in which the prebendary said

> 'It appears to be morally certain that as soon as the Reform Bill is disposed of, an attack will be made on deans and chaplains, and as certain that Durham will be the first object. It had occured to us that it will be prudent if possible to ward off the blow, and that no plan is so likely to take as making the public partakers of our income by annexing an establishment of enlarged education to our college'.[78]

In spite of the objections of whose who wished to see the new university opened to persons of all denominations a Bill was passed by parliament in the summer of 1832 which specified that all graduates should take the same religious tests as were required of the graduates of the University of Cambridge.

Summary

There are a number of significant points that stand out in the examination of the events surrounding university affairs in Scotland and England in the 1820s and 1830s.

Firstly, by adopting the infrequently used course of setting the events in Scotland in a context that covers England it seems clear that in spite of obvious differences there are significant similarities in the debates on the universities on each side of the border. In particular we can see that some individuals were directly involved both in the 1826 Scottish university Commission and in the establishment of the University of London. Joseph Hume was a keen supporter of Marischal College, Aberdeen and of the Gower Street institution while Robert Peel and the Earl of Aberdeen played their part in the 1826 Royal Commission and in the foundation of King's College, London. From this we can see that there was some consistency in the battle lines between the groups involved in university affairs and that the ideas supported by Peel, Aberdeen and the 'establishment' in London were consistently opposed by Hume and others who viewed the universities in a different light.

Secondly, the study of the 1820s and 1830s indicates that in both Scotland and England the church was deeply affected by and involved in university business and that changes in the relationship of the church and the state were seen to be closely linked to the question of the churches' role in university affairs. In many accounts of this period the authors offer the conclusion that the secularization of the state went hand in hand with the attempted secularization of the universities. This conclusion seems to beg the question of the nature of the relationship between the two processes.

Although we may be in danger of oversimplifying matters I wish to concentrate on that aspect of this situation that will connect with

the analysis provided in the next three chapters. Whilst other factors were clearly involved I wish to focus on the association of the Church of England with the aristocratic class.

I wish to suggest that in both Scotland and England the unity of church and state was being challenged by those who aimed to call into question the rights of those who had previously assumed an undisputed right to rule in both spheres. In the introductory chapter we saw that the English clergy, the gentry and the English aristocracy formed a mutually beneficial alliance that impinged upon university affairs in the form of the 'gentlemanly' ideal that lay behind the notion of liberal education. In studying the events surrounding the founding of London University we must note that an alternative formulation of the place of the university in English society was effective enough to produce a concrete outcome. However, the detailing of the exact nature of that formulation must be seen to be a problem. It is most easily described in the negative in that it drew together those who were united in their desire to provide some alternative to the education offered at Oxford and Cambridge. Expressed in the terms that will be relevant to the later chapters we can describe the opposition to the Oxbridge view as coming out of the professions and the mercantile section of the middle class. Yet this, it must be admitted, does not adequately describe the nature of the opposition to the aristocratic/church position.

Within the ranks of those supporting the founding of King's and University Colleges were a faction that can more clearly be identified as having the interests of the professional classes at heart. At University College the curriculum was developed to serve the three learned professions and at King's College the studies which prepared those who wished to pursue a career in the Church of England were much more directly related to their future career than the curriculum at Oxbridge. In his book on 'Professional Men' W.J. Reader comments on the changes involved in the formulation of the curriculum of the new London colleges when he says

> 'neither college, in fact, could afford to neglect 'practical studies', for both, like the Scottish and Irish universities, catered overwhelmingly for students who would have to earn their own living. King's College had a department of Engineering as early as 1838, and it also specialized in the professional education of Anglican clergymen, rather than simply educating them generally in the manner of Oxford and Cambridge.'[79]

So if we regard the events discussed in this chapter in terms of the three interest groups being focused upon we should observe that in both England and Scotland the relationship between the aristocratic and professional classes was the most important factor. Although this conflict can be seen on both sides of the border we ought to note that in England the nature of the difference was unlike that found in Scotland.

In England the aristocratic classes monopoly over university affairs was successfully challenged by the professional class. One section of the professional class supported the founding of the Gower Street institution while the other section took more account of traditional practices in the relationship between the church and the universities and supported the new institution built in the Strand.

While the analysis of the situation in England may suggest that the professional classes were in the process of making some inroads into the power of the aristocratic class in political and educational matters in Scotland the situation was slightly different. In the north the estate of the professional class was already high. In these circumstances we can conclude that the debate between the two classes had divergent results in London, Oxbridge and in the Lowlands of Scotland even though in each case the ideas being espoused were essentially the same. At Oxford and Cambridge the reforms started to break down the monopoly of educational ideas associated with the

aristocratic class. In London the desire to provide a university education that served the professional classes was successful, but modified by the power of opposing groups to alter the original aims. In Scotland the pursuit of professional studies was informed by the influence of the idea that a university education should also aim to produce 'gentlemen.' The liberal content of the education offered at the Scottish universities was a result, I would argue, of the power of the local professional class to maintain their view of liberal education in the face of an alternative notion that originated in England. Unlike Davie I would wish to relate the origins of the two formulations of liberal education to 'social' differences rather than 'national' differences, but in some ways this is splitting hairs. The social and national differences are inextricably connected. In Scotland an important component of the support for a liberal education was to differentiate the professional classes from the mercantile class. And so we can agree with Anderson's comments on the 1826 Royal Commission that

> 'The 1826 Commission was true to its age in giving little thought to the advancement of science or learning as a university function. Its aim was, above all, to make the universities more systematic and efficient educational institutions, turning out doctors, lawyers and ministers with a love of the classics and the manners of gentlemen.' [80]

The lack of a positive input on university affairs by the mercantile class in this period may be associated with a number of factors. The mercantile class were still an emerging force in British politics. The 1832 Reform Act did lead to the election of a few representatives of that class, but it did not produce any real change in the political balance of the House of Commons which was still dominated by the aristocratic class.

Furthermore all three groups were in general agreement at this time that the universities may not be the place to pursue scientific and technical studies. One aspect of this perception was that the

more successful merchants who could afford to send their sons to the universities were wary about those institutions. This 'anti-intellectualism' was an important feature of Victorian Britain. Speaking at the opening of Mason's College, Birmingham in the second half of the century T.H. Huxley referred to the attitude of 'practical men' and suggested that

> 'the idol whom they worship- rule of thumb- has been the source of the past prosperity, and will suffice for the future welfare of the arts and manufacturers. They were of opinion that science is speculative rubbish; that theory and practice have nothing to do with one another; and that the scientific habit of mind is an impediment, rather than an aid, in the conduct of ordinary affairs.'[81]

Walter Houghton quotes these words of Huxley in his book on 'The Victorian Frame of Mind' in which he observes that 'practical men' were quite right in so far as 'the Industrial Revolution owed very little to scientific theory'. Houghton points out that the industrialists of the first half of the century were

> 'proud of their class and indifferent to the social ambition which made Oxford and Cambridge inviting to the next generation. To them a university was a dangerous distraction.'[82]

The experience of the English universities provided some evidence to support this view. However the happenings at Glasgow university may be seen as evidence that the universities could, if given the opportunity, contribute to industrial progress. Again the experience in England and Scotland provides a contrasting picture.

Chapter Four

The Mid-century Reform of Oxford and Cambridge, Open Competition in the Indian Civil Service and the Universities (Scotland) Act of 1858 in context

In this part of the thesis the study of the events surrounding the reform of the two English universities will be related to the campaign to institute competitive examinations for controlling entry into the senior positions in the civil service of the East India Company. After tracing some of the themes that connected these two reform movements we will turn to look at their relationship to the changes taking place in the Scottish universities.

This chapter will provide an analysis of these three conjunctures that draws on the formulation of the differences between the contending groups that are a feature of this thesis. In the discussion of the mid-century we will need to study the conflict between the educational ideas of the old aristocratically-based class that were working to preserve the status quo and the ideas of those advocating 'professional education'. In studying these happenings we will examine the nature of the compromises reached by the various groups involved in university matters.

The analysis must be sensitive to the changes in the relationship of the church and the state in the north and in the south to see how those alterations had an impact on the universities. The process of secularization previously noted will provide a focus in this chapter. To this end we must start by recording that in 1843 a large section of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland reacted to the failure to resolve a ten year dispute by walking out of that years General Assembly. The group which left the established church formed a rival church under the

name of the Free Church of Scotland. This schism in the Church of Scotland was over the question of the power of local lairds to appoint ministers. The Free-churchmen objected to the continued patronage of the old landed interests and wanted to institute a more democratic system of appointing ministers.

Set into a British context Ferguson suggests that the ten years conflict which lead up to the Disruption should not be seen purely in terms of a battle between church and state. He maintains that in common with the Church of England the Scots were being influenced by the events in Ireland. Ferguson says

> 'The so-called Ten Years Conflict . . . which ended in the Disruption of 1843, was not simply a battle between church and state; it was, in fact, a by-product of a bitter controversy which first blew up in 1829 stimulated by Roman Catholic emancipation.'[1]

The question of the emancipation of the Catholics in Ireland was to have an impact on English internal politics in the second half of the nineteenth century. As regards the mid-century period we can see that the Church of Scotland was more responsive to questions of secularization than the Church of England or, expressed in equally valid terms, that the Church of England was more resistant to changes than their northern counterpart. The relationship of the church with the state in England was much closer than in Scotland and this is what Ferguson implies was important. As previously noted he says

> 'The whole place of the church in modern society was what was being contended for, and it raised serious questions about the constitution and powers of the state.'[2]

In this way the question of patronage served, in Ferguson's view, as 'a focus for deeper controversies.'

Bearing these points in mind let us now turn to study the universities to see the impact on these institutions of the varying changes in the relationship of the church and the state.

The Mid-Century Reform of Oxford and Cambridge

In studying the universities of Oxford and Cambridge in this period we must focus our attention on the events surrounding the ordering of the mid-century Royal Commissions so as to gain some understanding of the context against which those Commissions can be set.

We must therefore go back to 1834 when Sir William Hamilton, a professor of Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, published an article in the Edinburgh Review which severely criticized the two ancient English universities. Hamilton had gained a Snell Exhibition after taking his first degree at Glasgow University which allowed him to continue his studies at Balliol College, Oxford; he thus had first-hand knowledge of both university systems. Hamilton suggested that Oxford and Cambridge had done little to encourage learning in England and that this was attributable to the fact that the duties of the university in both towns had been usurped by the colleges. The contribution by Hamilton was only one of over thirty pamphlets that were published around this time in which the English universities were criticized.

Also in 1834 G.W. Wood, a Unitarian M.P., gained widespread support for a Bill introduced into the Commons which sought to abolish the imposition of religious tests on the entrants to Oxford and on the graduates of Cambridge. The students of these two collegiate unions were required to take an oath swearing their acceptance of the 'thirty-nine articles' of faith. These tests had originally been introduced in ancient times to ensure the exclusion of Roman Catholics, but by the middle of the nineteenth-century the tests had the effect of excluding all religious groups save Anglicans. The continued administration of the religious tests of faith were criticized in that they served to exclude honourable Christians who were not Anglicans while at the same time failing to prevent the entry of dishonourable

atheists who were quite prepared to take an oath which they regarded as farcical.

The Bill introduced by Wood in 1834 passed through the Lower House with a majority of 185 to 44. His initiative had gained the support of a good number of the residents of Cambridge, but had failed to elicit the support of Oxford residents even after the pleas of the famous Dr Arnold. In the House of Lords the vote was reversed; the Bill was rejected because the Duke of Wellington and the Archbishops convinced their Lordships that the reforms were an indirect threat to the role of the Church as a national institution.

Although agitation for reform continued over the next decade or more the universities remained untroubled until the second half of the century. In April 1850 James Heywood and his Radical supporters in the Commons moved an Address asking the government to appoint a Royal Commission to visit the universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin. Although these groups had made previous applications of a similar nature without success the universities began to fear that this new initiative mightprompt action because of the rise of Lord John Russell to the Premiership. We may surmise that Heywood had good reasons for pressing for reform because although he had excelled as a student at Trinity College, Cambridge he had been prevented from graduating by the 'test regulations.'

This experience did not prevent Heywood from taking an interest in educational matters - it may even have been a source of his involvement. In any event Heywood had taken an active part in higher education in his home town of Manchester through his position as a Trustee on the Board which administered Owens College.

In his speech to the House of Commons in support of his motion Heywood went to some lengths to reiterate the long list of complaints that had been levelled at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge by his Radical supporters. At the end of his polemic he requested that

> 'Her Majesty would graciously be pleased to issue Her Royal Commission of Enquiry into that state of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin, with a view to assist in the adaption of these institutions to the requirements of modern times'.[3]

It was assumed in most quarters that the Prime Minister would reject Heywood's motion out of hand, but, as Ward describes

> 'just before the adjournment of the debate Russell announced that he could not agree to Heywood's motion which amounted to an indictment of the Universities, but that he would advise the Crown to issue a royal commission of enquiry'.[4]

This announcement caused a great deal of excitement and consternation. At the two ancient universities strenuous efforts were made to persuade Lord John Russell to change his mind and to allow the universities to put their own houses in order. The Prime Minister's position was difficult; Prince Albert asked him to leave the inquiry to the universities while the Radicals gained the support of certain Oxford professors who urged him to live up to his resolution. The adjourned debate was postponed twice.

On the 18th July the delayed debate finally took place. Understandably in this debate the Radical M.Ps. continued to press for the issuing of the Commission. Against them were ranged the supporters of the universities who argued that the government was exceeding its authority in considering the ordering of a Commission and that even if they had the power to order an enquiry they should resist doing so in order to allow the universities to reform themselves.

W.E. Gladstone, although destined for high office as a Liberal, was at this time sitting as the Tory Member for the Oxford University seat. In that position he was to argue that

> 'I do not resist this Commission in consequence of any fears I entertain of its immediate consequences to the University. I oppose it as a bad and mischievous precedent . . .'[5]

However the majority of Members took the opposite opinion. On the division at the end of the debate the government obtained a majority of twenty-two in favour of the ordering of the Commission.

Most descriptions of Oxford and Cambridge in this period refer to the need for reform. For example, in his article on the 'Victorian National Intelligentsia' Roach says

> 'both universities were tied to the straitjacket of ancient statutes which could be only partially observed; in so far as they were effective, the rights which they secured - the privileges of parishes, schools and counties to enjoy endowments, the rights of founders' kin, the appropriation of fellowships or professorships by non-residents - were anachronisms; they formed a whole series of "rotten boroughs" which a reforming age naturally wished to sweep away.'[6]

And yet the opposition to the Commissions continued. Lord John Russell had to tread very carefully as he was only too aware that the aristocratic and high church supporters of the universities were doing all they could to obstruct the issuing of the Royal Assent. In a spirit of compromise Russell agreed that the Commission should not be able to compel witnesses to give evidence - he even invited the Hebdomadal Board, the governing body at Oxford University, to submit a list of names for appointment on the Commission.

In all the arguments and debates about the reform of the English

universities at this time Oxford was the epicentre of the debate. As the more conservative of the two institutions Oxford was seen, and saw itself, as in the vanguard of the struggle against those who wished to interfere in university affairs. In these circumstances when the waring factions reached any compromises over the reform of Oxford those reforms were usually accepted at Cambridge without a great struggle. The Oxford University Commission reported before their colleagues at Cambridge and the Oxford Bill was presented to parliament in advance of the legislation on Cambridge. And so in order to reach an understanding of the mid-century reform of the universities of England we can concentrate on the study of Oxford with some confidence that we will not miss anything significant.

The government appointed seven Commissioners to inquire into 'the state, discipline, studies and revenue of the University and Colleges of Oxford.'[7] The parallel Commission on Cambridge consisted of five members.[8] In each case the Commissioners were all alumni of the university they were expected to investigate. In fact the majority on each panel had maintained very close contacts with their former colleges in the form of fellowships, professorships or even Masterships. Both Commissions were headed by a Bishop - the Bishop of Norwich was the chairman of the Oxford enquiry while the Bishop of Chester performed the same duties at Cambridge - and supported by at least two or three clerics. All were English except for one solitary Scot.

In spite of the best efforts of Lord John Russell complaints were made about the composition of the Commissions. The Radicals drew attention to the number of Oxbridge men appointed as Commissioners while others thought the panels were too liberal in emphasis. In his chapter on the Oxford Commission and its report in his book 'Victorian Oxford' Ward comments

'Conservative opponents of the Royal Commission

> spared no pains to discredit the report in advance. The Commission, it was urged, had been packed with liberals; its conclusions must therefore be a foregone conclusion. .'[9]

Even during the course of their deliberations the Commission was faced with vigorous opposition. The Vice-Chancellor of Oxford went so far as to decline to comply with a request for information.

While the Commissioners waited patiently for a reply to their request for information from the Vice-Chancellor the Hebdomadal Board applied directly to the Privy Council asking for the withdrawal of the Commission. The Heads of the Colleges who made up the Hebdomadal Board decided to tactfully withdraw their petition to the Privy Council when they heard that they had met and decided to advise the Queen to reject the petition.

However the Heads of the Colleges continued to fight the inquiry. They offered passive resistence to the Commissioners in the hope of hindering their job. Fortunately others in the university were only too willing to answer the questions the Heads of Colleges wanted to quash. Certain colleges, many university professors and most of the junior members of the university decided to co-operate with the Commission. In his history of English education Simon says

> 'both Commissions obtained full co-operation from the university professors, who, as a group, had long been in favour of reform but powerless to bring it about.'[10]

One of the rising stars in the ranks of the Oxford professoriat at this time was Benjamin Jowett, a Tutor at Balliol College. On these matters Jowett commented that

> 'There is nothing I less wish than to see Oxford

> turned into a German or London University. On the other hand, it is at all probable that we shall be allowed to remain as we are for twenty years longer, the one solitary, exclusive, unnational corporation . .'[11]

In terms of the themes being discussed in this thesis we can note that the reaction to the Royal Commission can be categorized into two main camps. In the first camp are the Heads of the Colleges, the Hebdomadal Board, who wished to uphold the traditional clerical and collegiate ideal. They were all themselves clerics and exercised considerable power and patronage in their positions as the Heads of the colleges.It fell to this group to fight for the old aristocratic view of the place of the university. In the second camp were the professors and the college tutors who, although they had slightly different ambitions, both wished to see the creation of an academic profession that would replace the existing teaching structure. In the first half of the century most of the teaching was done by young graduates who were awaiting the opportunity to take upon posts in the Church of England. In his book 'From Clergyman to Don' Engel maintains that the question of whether the university ought to provide a career for academics 'largely determined the shape of modern Oxford.'[12] Although we might observe that there were pressures from outside the universities for reform we ought to keep a sense of perspective and appreciate that the real pressure for reform came from those wishing to see the 'professionalization' of the academic living within the universities.

Bearing in mind these points let us return to the 1850s. In his biography of the Oxford University M.P., William Gladstone, Morley says of the Report of the Commissioners that

> 'Mr Gladstone thought it one of the ablest productions submitted in his recollection to Parliament.'[13]

We must have some reservations about accepting this statement at face value. Whatever Gladstone thought of the Report the issuing

of it was the occasion for a complete turnabout in his attitude to university reform.

The tone of the Report on Oxford University reflected a certain antagonism on the part of the Commissioners to those who had attempted to obstruct their work. However the important thing for us to see is that the Commission established a precedent for the view that the two ancient universities were national institutions and as such that the government had a right to enquire into their affairs.

In the conclusions to the Report the Commissioners drew attention to certain recommendations. They said

> 'Of the proposals which affect the University, the most important are those which we have made for remodelling the Constitution, and for abolishing the existing monopoly of the Colleges and Halls by allowing students to reside in Oxford without the expense of connexion with those bodies. In regard to the Colleges, we would especially urge the immediate necessity of opening the Fellowships and Scholarships, of attaching Professorships to certain Colleges, of increasing the number and value of Scholarships, or granting to the Colleges the power of altering their statutes, and, above all, of prohibiting as unlawful the oaths to observe the statutes.'[14]

Simons offers his own interpretation of the conclusions of the Commissioners when he notes that

> 'The recommendations sought to open the way to changes in government, teaching and recruitment of students. They proposed broadening the base of university government, particularly by the inclusion of the professoriat and a strengthening of the university vis-a-vis the colleges, notably by building up a core

> of university teachers. They advocated a transformation in the content of education to allow for a certain degree of specialization, including mathematics and science, stress being laid on the need for better facilities for teaching these subjects. Finally they recommended abolition of special privilages open to 'founders kin' and the breaking of local restrictions on scholarships and fellowships, in favour of open competition.'[15]

Engel's interpretation of the Royal Commission and its report concludes that as the Heads of Colleges and the College Tutors failed to co-operate with the enquiry that

> 'The Royal Commission fell by default to the advocates of the scholarly version of the 'professorial system' . . . . In all the Commission's recommendations, the raising of the status, powers, and importance of the professoriate was stressed at the expense of the colleges.'[16]

It looked at one time as if the Commission might have been recalled on the falling of Russell's administration, but in the event the Commission survived the change of government.

In his book on the rise of the professional classes in the nineteenth century Reader comments on the Reports on the universities when he says

> 'Two important general points emerge from the reports. One is that up to 1850 professional education was not taken seriously either at Oxford or Cambridge. The other is that education at Oxford and Cambridge was extremely expensive.'[17]

The Oxford Report certainly commented upon the deficiencies in professional education, but it also made it clear that the ideas of liberal education traditionally associated with the ancient universities should not be completely ignored. The Commission stated that

> 'it has been serious loss, both to Oxford and to the learned Professions, that the studies which would prepare young men to enter on professional life should have been so completely neglected.'[18]

In attempting to satisfy the demands of those who wished to see Oxford continue to provide a liberal education and of those who wanted to see the university branch out to provide an education suitable for a graduate who planned to enter one of the learned professions the Commissioners were forced to search for a compromise solution. Their Report recommended

> 'that all students after giving satisfactory evidence of classical knowledge at the Intermediate Examinations, should be relieved from the necessity of continuing the studies of the Grammar school, and should be at liberty for the latter period of their career to devote themselves to pursuits preparatory to their future Professions.'[19]

In noting this departure from the established pattern of education given at the English universities of Oxford and Cambridge Reader correctly draws attention to the fact that

> 'The Royal Commission which investigated Oxford and Cambridge in the early fifties urged them to apply their resources to professional education.'[20]

However those pressing for reform were to find that it was one thing for the Commissioners to make recommendations, but quite

another for those ideas to be implimented. Soon after the Reports were published parliament was dissolved and a General Election was called. The first election in July proved to be indecisive and so another had to be held in December. After some delay the Earl of Aberdeen, now an elder Statesman in British political life, managed to form a coalition government. The Cabinet of his administration contained six Whigs, six Peelites and a Radical; Gladstone served as Chancellor of the Exchequer and Lord John Russell was made leader of the House of Commons after a short term as Foreign Secretary. Subsequent events indicate that there is some substance to the idea put forward by Simon that

> 'Convinced that reform was inescapable, Gladstone "Submitted to it in order to avert a greater evil", telling his Oxford constitutents that if the Bill he drafted were thrown out "no other half so favourable would ever again be brought in."[21]

Gladstone set out to frame a Bill on the basis of the Commission's report. In his book on the universities and the state Berdahl says that the 'chief theme' of the Commissioner's report was 'typified by the . . . emphatic statement' that

> '. . . such an institution (as the University) cannot be regarded as a mere aggregation of private interests; it is eminently national. It would seem therefore, to be a matter of public policy that such measures should be taken as may seem to raise its efficiency to the highest point and to diffuse its benefits most widely.'[22]

As Chancellor of the Exchequer Gladstone was under considerable pressure to devote his energies towards finding resources for the country to pursue the war against Russia that was being fought in the Crimea. However he managed to divert a considerable amount of time to the task of framing a Bill for the reform of Oxford. He

also expended a large amount of energy in consulting with all those who had a direct interest in the reforms. The Bill was brought before parliament in March 1854. It was subjected to a great deal of criticism. On the Conservative side it was attacked for doing too much and on the Radical side for not doing enough. As Berdahl notes

> 'When Gladstone proposed, Disraeli, his arch rival, opposed: "You will have much to answer for if you place the Universities of this country under the control of the state."[23]

From the other side of the House of Commons Heywood also spoke against the Bill. In its passage through the Commons there were over twenty divisions on the provisions of the Bill. Nearly every clause was subjected to long debate which was often only settled by a vote. Armytage suggests that

> 'the government realised that to get the Bill through the House, it would have to be cut down. So sixteen clauses of great detail . . . were jettisoned with the idea that the ensuing statutary Commission would take them up.'[24]

The modified Bill still failed to satisfy James Heywood and after some difficulties he succeeded in getting an amendment passed which abolished the religious tests for any degree in Arts, Law, or Medicine, but which retained these oaths in Theology. In spite of some opposition the Oxford Bill passed through the Lords without being amended. As most of the contentious matters had been debated and compromises reached over the Oxford Bill the enactment to reform Cambridge had a much easier passage through both Houses in 1856.

In accordance with the Oxford Act the Executive Commission began to sit in the autumn of 1855 to carry through the desired reforms.

The Cambridge Executive Commission began its work soon after. Armytage describes how both Commissions were able to bring about the recommendations of the 1850 enquiry when he says

> 'To effect changes in both Universities, Executive Commissioners were established with powers previously denied to the Commissioners of 1850: they could compel the production of documents and the donation of information. By these means they were able to regroup endowments and to derestrict fellowships.'[25]

The mid-century changes in the government and administration of Oxford and Cambridge cleared the ground in preparation for later reforms. Although the mid-century Commissions recommended widespread changes in the curriculum and organization of the universities these changes were not introduced by the Executive Commission . The pace of reform was such that perceivable alterations in the curriculum, for example, were not really apparent until the 1870s. However the ending of the dominance of the narrow interests of the clerics at the two universities resulted in an appreciable increase in the enrolments to Oxford and Cambridge as these institutions attracted an increasing number of young men leaving the public schools.

But before we attempt to summarize all the events in England at the turn of the mid-century we need to consider the impact of the reforms to the recruitment procedures to the Civil Services of England and India.

Open Competition in the Indian Civil Service

The delay in implimenting the more drastic reforms at Oxford and Cambridge until the 1870s was parelleled when it came to the implimentation of changes to the recruitment procedure of entrants to the Home Civil Service. Kitson Clark believes that the forces which had rallied round to oppose the Corn Laws were united by their opposition to the aristocracy, but that their unity was dissipated after that success and the aristocracy continued to prosper. He continues

> 'so in the middle of the nineteenth century, instead of a period of rapidly accelerating reform there seems to be a lull . . . Reform for which men had clamoured were left incomplete, or not pursued at all . . .'

Kitson Clark runs through a list of examples and concludes with a reference to the

> 'Violent attacks had for long been made on the recruitment of the Civil Service by aristocratic or political nomination, and the cure, entry by competitive examination, was proposed by the Trevelyan-Northcote report in 1854 but this expedient was not generally used for the Home Civil Service till after 1870'.[26]

However at the same time as Gladstone was working on the draft of his Oxford Bill a measure to renew the authority of the East India Company to control and govern British possessions on the Indian sub-continent was presented to parliament. In that Bill a clause was inserted which enabled the Company to reform the recruitment procedure into their Civil Service. The clause specified that in future the Company should introduce a system of competitive examinations for

candidates wishing to gain senior positions in the service. This proposal intended to do away with the existing system of appointment which relied on the exercise of patronage by the members of the Board of Control of the East India Company. In his article on this subject Hughes expresses the opinion that

> 'It cannot be too strongly emphasised that in the minds of its leading advocates the reform was to be directly related to the recent reforms in the University of Oxford, the throwing open of fellowships to examinational merit, sponsored by Gladstone and Lord John Russell.'[27]

It is clear that Gladstone was closely involved in both reforms. Stafford Northcote, his private secretary, and Sir Charles Trevelyan, one of the Assistent Secretaries to the Treasury, were the authors of the parallel report on the Home Civil Service. Although this report was shelved the movement for the reform of the Indian Civil Service went ahead with the help of Trevelyan. The President of the Board of Control of the E.I.C., Sir Charles Wood, was being pressed by Trevelyan to act on the clause in the Bill by drawing his attention to a pamphlet which he believed to have been written by an educated Indian. He described the author as a 'clever fellow' and suggested that

> 'The time has certainly arrived when steps must be taken to maintain the relative superiority of the European servants, and nothing short of your plans of competing examinations will accomplish this.'[28]

The idea of limiting the power of the Board of Directors was not a new one. In the 1830s T.B. Macaulay, the historian and M.P. for Edinburgh, had written a paper proposing that entrance into the service should be determined on the basis of competitive examinations. Around this time Macaulay had been sent out to India as a member of E.I.C.'s Supreme Council. He met Trevelyan. By the 1850s in England

Trevelyan had married Macaulay's sister and for a while the two main characters involved in the reform of the Indian Civil Service lived under one roof in London.

In these circumstances it should come as no surprise to learn that Trevelyan involved Macaulay in the task of carrying through the reforms. In November 1853 he wrote to Sir Charles Wood to say

> 'I have again asked Macaulay what his feeling is about serving on a Commission for the purpose of launching the selection of Writers by competition and his answer was that he would do anything rather that it should fail a second time.' [29]

Six months later Sir Charles Wood wrote to Macaulay to ask him to accept the job of Chairman of a Committee to assist in the framing of the regulations for setting up a system of selecting Writers by examination. Even though he was in poor health at this time Macaulay accepted Wood's invitation.

His fellow Committee members were a distinguished crowd; they were Lord Ashburton, a Peelite with a reputation as a classics scholar; the Rev Henry Melvill, the Principal of the training centre for servants of the East India Company at Haileybury; Sir John Shaw Lefevre, the Clerk of the Parliaments and, finally, Benjamin Jowett, a tutor at Balliol College, Oxford who seems to have been at the centre of most educational matters in this period.

There is good reason to believe that the selection of the members of this Committee was intended more to impress outsiders than to use their collective expertise. The task of compiling the report was assigned to Macaulay on the first of July. According to his journal it took him four or five days to complete the report. It appears from his journal he worked alone and that

Macaulay only consulted with his fellow committeemen after he had completed the Report. In a letter to his lawyer friend Thomas Howard Ellis, written on the 11th of July, 1854 he says

> 'I have been working four or five days at my report on the India Civil Service, and have at last finished it. It is much longer than I anticipated that it would be and has given me great trouble . . . On the 22nd I am to be in town for the purpose of considering the report in company with my colleagues . . '[30]

The committee meeting did not lead to any significant alteration to Macaulay's original draft. However, although it might appear that the committee members merely acted as a rubber stamp this may well have been due to the fact that all the main points of the Report had been settled even before Macaulay and his committee were appointed.

In his account of the events in the two years leading up to the appointment of the Macaulay committee, Moore comments that Jowett had already been at work to prepare the way for reforms. Moore indicated that Jowett had persuaded Sir Charles Wood to insert an amendment into the 1853 India Act which gave the East India Company the authority to examine candidates who had not been educated at the companies training college at Haileybury. Moore continues by pointing out that in 1854

> 'the influence which prevailed upon Wood to take power to open the Civil Service examination to general competition induced him to use it. Jowett worked tenaciously for this end. He became an energetic and influental member of Macaulay's Committee'.[31]

Although Moore may think that Jowett played an important role in these matters Macaulay clearly felt that his own contribution was paramount. Writing to his friend Ellis again on the 9th January, 1855 he asks

'Did you notice among the advertisements in the Times of this morning the notice about the examinations for the India Civil Service. My plan is adopted almost to the letter'.[32]

In fact the detailed regulations announced that the first set of examinations would be held in London during the summer. The only difference between the report by Macaulay and the published regulations was in the specification of the age limit for candidates. Macaulay had recommended a limit of 23, but the Times specified that candidates should be under the age of 22 years.

In his report Macaulay had specified an age limit of 23 years so as to suit the graduates of Oxford and Cambridge. However, Sir Charles Wood had reduced the limit to 22 years as he took account of the views of those who were experienced in working for the East India Company. It was thought it was in the recruits best interests to get them out to the sub-continent as soon as possible as it had been observed that older recruits found it more difficult to adjust to their new environment and experience difficulties in coping with 'culture shock'.

When the regulations were published the spokesman of the two ancient universities were quick to express their disapproval of the fact that graduates from Oxbridge would be too old to enter for the examinations.

Macaulay had also noticed the alteration in the age limit. He wrote to Wood in January 1855 to say

'I am a good deal vexed by the change which you have made in our plan. It is a change of great moment. By reducing the age of the candidates from twenty-three to twenty-two, you will, I am satisfied, exclude a very large number of the very best men. This alteration which you have made will tell greatly

> against Oxford and Cambridge which, much as they need reform, are still the first schools in the empire, and in favour of the London University, the Scotch Universities and the Queen's College in Ireland'.[33]

Macaulay and the Oxford and Cambridge lobby were successful in their objections; the age limit was raised from 22 to 23 years so as to allow the graduates of these two universities to compete against the younger graduates from the other universities.

Understandably the alteration of the regulations was not welcomed in Scotland. One of the most outspoken of the Scottish professors, James Stuart Blackie wrote to The Edinburgh Evening Courant to state that the new regulations clearly suited the students of Oxbridge over and above the students of the Scottish universities.

Although these examinations were for only a few posts their influence was acknowledged to be widespread. Macaulay was well aware of the significance of the examinations; in his report for the East India Company he points out that

> 'The educated youth of the United Kingdom are henceforth to be invited to engage in a competition in which about 40 prizes will, on an average, be gained each year. Everyone of these prizes is nothing less than an honourable social position, and a comfortable independence for life . . . It is notorious that the examinations for Trinity fellowships have, directly or indirectly, done much to give direction to the studies of Cambridge and of all the numerous schools which are the feeders of Cambridge - What, then, is likely to be the effect of a competition for prizes which will be ten times

> as numerous as the Trinity fellowships and of which each one will be more valuable than a Trinity fellowship. We are inclined to think that the examination for situations in the Civil Service of the East India Company will produce an effect which will be felt in every seat of learning throughout the realm, at Oxford and Cambridge, at the University of London and the University of Durham, at Edinburgh and Glasgow, at Dublin, at Cork and at Belfast.'[34]

Even the prospective candidates realized the value of the prizes on offer; in July 1855 one hundred and twelve competitors appeared at the examination hall to compete for one of the twenty places available in that year.

According to Beyer's analysis of the backgounds of these competitors

> 'Seventy-three of the candidates were from English institutions and fifty-one of these were from Oxford and Cambridge. Twenty-three were from Ireland and fifteen were from Scotland. Of the successful twenty, seventeen were from England (eight from Oxford, six from Cambridge, two from the University of London and one from King's College, London), two were from Ireland (one from Queen's College, Galloway (sic) and one from Queen's College, Cork), one was from the University of Edinburgh.'[35]

In his portrait of the Victorian age George Young contended that 'Macaulay annexed the Indian Civil Service to the Universities'[36]. The results of the first sitting of the examinations would seem to support this view. However, Dewey feels that Young's view is an oversimplification; he maintains that to get a true picture of the Committee's

recommendations we have to look at the 'peculiar relationship between Whig grandees and intelligensia in mid-Victorian England.' Dewey says

> 'Macaulay, Trevelyan, Northcote, Gladstone were the link-men through whom an old aristocracy of of birth concluded an alliance with a new aristocracy of intellect; and from their fusion the chief impulse to reform derived.'[37]

Dewey goes on to suggest that the web of influence at this particular conjuncture had three main strands; one within the cabinet, one within the educational establishment and one group acting as mediators. Of the nine central characters named by Dewey five were educated at Oxford, three went to Cambridge and Trevelyan had been schooled at Haileybury College.

This idea of a new 'aristocracy of intellect' is supported by Noel Annan in his article on 'The Intellectual Aristocracy'. In that work Annan draws attention to the fact that

> 'at the beginning of the nineteenth century . . A particular type of middle-class family then started in intermarry and produce children who became scholars and teachers. They joined those who at Oriel and Balliol in Oxford, or at Trinity and St John's in Cambridge, were setting new standards in electing to fellowships, they led the movement for academic reform within the universities . . .'[38]

However Annan quickly points out that they were 'not a narrow professorate' for the celibacy regulations procluded that possibility and so

> 'they overflowed into the new professions. The days

> when Addison could define the professions as divinity, law and physic were past. Not only were the old professions expanding to include Solocitors and Apothecaries, but the establishment in 1828 of the Institute of Civil Engineers . . . . marked the rise of a new kind of professional man. Members of these intellectual families became the new professional civil servants at a time when government had become too complicated and technical to be handled by the ruling class and their dependents. They joined the Indian and Colonial Services or . . . .'[39]

Annan continued to list those areas into which this group had expanded; for us it is important to note that this group were in the process of redefining the 'professions.'

Although this group redefined certain areas of the occupational structure their efforts to bring about a change in the idea of the role of the university in the Common Rooms of the Oxbridge colleges was less successful.

Annan names the more important members of this 'intellectual aristocracy' and in his list we can find the Macaulays, the Trevelyans and the Darwins. To explain the ethos of this group and to offer an example of their ability to impose that ethos Annan says

> 'If they can be said to have had a Bill of Rights it was the Trevelyan-Northcote report of 1853 on the reform of the Civil Service . . .'[40]

The tenticles of this 'intellectual aristocracy' stretched out into the later half of the nineteenth century. In the next chapter we will come across this group again. But for now we must reflect on the outcomes of the reforms initiated by Trevelyan and Macaulay.

Macaulay, in his report, was sensitive to the charge that the marking system and curriculum of the examinations might seem biased in favour of Oxbridge. He says

> 'It will be necessary that a certain number of marks should be assigned to each subject, and that the place of the candidate should be determined by the sum total of the marks which he has gained. The marks ought, we conceive, to be distributed among the subjects of examination, in such a manner that no part of the kingdom, and no class of schools, shall exclusively furnish servants to the East India Company. It would be grossly unjust, for example, to the great academical institutions of England, not to allow skill in Greek and Latin versification to have a considerable share in determining the issue of the competition . . . . On the other hand we must remember that, in the north of this island the art of metrical composition in the ancient languages is very little cultivated . . . . We have with an anxious desire to deal fairly by all parts of the United Kingdom, and by all places of liberal education, framed the following scale, we venture to submit for your consideration.

English Language and Literature	
Composition	500
History	500
General Literature	500
	1500
Greek	750
Latin	750
French	375
German	375

Italian	375
Mathematics, pure and mixed	1000
Natural Sciences	500
Moral Sciences	500
Sanscrit	575
Arabic	375
	6875

,41

Although the Scottish newspapers had commented on the Indian Civil Service examinations when the regulations had been announced, it was only after the results were known that the significance of these innovations struck home.

There were two alternative interpretations for the poor performance of the Scottish candidates vis-à-vis their English counterparts. Either that, as Beyer suggests

> 'Although Macaulay had stressed the importance of designing examinations which would be fair to students throughout the Kingdom, these results indicate his lack of success'.[42]

or that, as The Times suggested at the time

> 'As the Universities test the merit of the schools these competitions test the merit of the Universities . . . We strongly suspect that the Scottish Universities . . . take no active measures to secure the success of their candidates'.[43]

thus clearly implying that the Scottish University system was to blame for the poor performance of Scottish students.

The Scots were particularly concerned about the implications of these results because in the years prior to the introduction of the examinations they had done very well out of the patronage of the Directors of the East India Company. In his analysis of the recruitment and training of European Civil Servants for the Company Cohn comments that

> 'The directors of the East India Company, and by extension the Civil Service, were recruited from a very restricted group in English Society centred essentially in London and drawn from banking and commercial families and landed groups in Scotland and in the South-east of England'.[44]

The inclusion of Scots in this privileged group can be explained as an outcome of the connection between the Board of Central of the Company and the main 'patron' of Scottish affairs at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Henry Dundas. Harvie points out

> 'It was to be Cornwallis's reforms, separating political from commercial control and Europeanising the services, that really opened India to the Scots, especially as the ruling power on the Board of Control in London was none other than Henry Dundas. The twenty years of Dundas' reign meant that tranquillity in Scotland was assisted by transferring much of the country's talent to India, both to the army and to the administration. For almost a century British India was to be dominated by a disproportionate number of Scots administrators . . . .'[45]

In these circumstances the failure of Scottish students to gain places through the competitive system was a traumatic experience. University reformers were forced to take account of the results of the examinations. A Professor from Aberdeen, Alexander Kilgour, rubbed salt

in the wound by suggesting that the one and only success, a student returned from Edinburgh University, 'owed very little of his education to Scotland'.[46]

Now, whether or not the Indian Civil Service examinations were biased in favour of the ancient English Universities as against those of Scotland requires an evaluation of motive and intention which is extremely difficult to make. The difficulites are increased by the fact that in many ways the Universities of England and Scotland were very different and therefore a comparison of the two is problematic. They served different clients, they worked in different ways and they had different aims. It is, therefore, doubtful whether Macaulay's ambition to be 'fair' to all the universities of all parts of the United Kingdom was ever achieveable.

The fact that the instigators of these reforms were closely connected to Oxford and Cambridge may well have coloured their views as to what constituted an appropriate education for the India Civil Service. The age limit specified in the first advertisements for the examinations in 1855 did not suit the students of the English Universities. However, within a few weeks the upper age limitation had been raised to 23 years of age; this allowed Oxford and Cambridge graduates to enter for the exams after they had finished their undergraduate studies.

As we have already noted the raising of the age limit was not in the best interests of the E.I.C. The alteration in the maximum age of candidates suited the graduates of Oxbridge admirably. At the same time the students from the Scottish universities found themselves at a distinct disadvantage in having to compete with English students who were, on average, about 3 years older than they were and who had, as a consequence, received three years extra education.

Furthermore, as Beyer points out, the fact that

> 'the examiners were chosen exclusively from Oxford and Cambridge except in those subjects like modern and oriental languages'[47]

which were not taught at the two oldest universities, can be seen as a clear indication that Macaulay's desire to be 'fair' to students from all parts of the United Kingdon took second place to his primary task of ensuring that only 'gentlemen' were successful in the examinations.

To understand the significance of this point we ought to note that when the Trevelyan-Northcote Report was published in March 1853 it had raised a storm of protest. The Reports suggestion that recruitment should be on the basis of competitive examinations had conjured up the fear in some minds that the civil service would become over-run with uncouth, but knowlegeable persons. Kellner and Crowther-Hunt tell us that even Queen Victoria was not amused by this possibility; they maintained that

> 'Queen Victoria feared that examinations would open up high office to 'low people without breeding or feelings of gentlemen'.[48]

In his article on the notion of 'competition wallahs' Clive confirms this prejudice. He notes that the protest against the examinations deflected the direction of the reforms and concludes

> 'the impulse was reformist; but it was scarcely democratic. The new system was intended to produce civilians who conformed to the ideal of the gentleman'.[49]

The ideal of the gentleman was the standard which Macaulay adopted in his schema for the reform of the entrance requirements of the East India Company. So rather than imagining Macaulay had a prejudice against Scots we should accept that the products of the

Scottish universities did not receive the type of education deemed suitable for a gentleman. According to the definition of a liberal education adopted by Macaulay a gentleman would have studied classics and mathematics. A quick glance at the marking scheme devised for the Indian Civil Service examinations confirms that Greek and Latin and Mathematics all received a favourable weighting.

At this half-way point in the century the notion of liberal education was the subject of renewed scrutiny. In 1853 Cardinal Newman had published a lecture on 'The Idea of a University' in which he offered a rather idiosyncratic, and therefore criticized, version of what constituted a liberal education. There can be no doubt that those involved in university and civil service reform in England at this time were aware of the controversy and still valued the notion of mind training and the idea of character formation that were part of Newman's definition. These aspects were seen as more important than the values put forward by those advocating the extention of professional education or those supporting the extension of science teaching in the universities.

In Scotland matters were seen rather differently. Whereas in England the gentlemen produced by a liberal education would most likely live a leisured existence, in Scotland the gentlemen would more likely practice one of the learned professions. The notion of liberal education had its place in the Scottish universities in the form of the qualities assumed to be encouraged in the study of philosophy. The two notions of mind training and character formation that were deemed important in England were also valued in Scotland. However the means of achieving that end was different. In England the study of the classics and mathematics were assumed to be the only appropriate way of imparting a liberal education. In most debates in England at this time it was assumed that one referred to a liberal education in the form adopted in the English universities. In trying to elicit the differences between the Scottish and English versions of liberal education we must conclude that they were not so much educational, as social.

The social prestige of the form of liberal education practiced in Oxbridge imparted a social kudos that the Scottish universities, by their very nature, could not match.

And so an implication of Davie's analysis that the 'anglicizers' continued advocacy of the English form of liberal education was connected with the fact that they wished to emulate the social kudos that surrounded Oxford and Cambridge seems to be correct. While in England the idea of liberal education was used to define a gentleman in Scotland the local version of that same concept was used to distinguish a members of the professions from the mercantile section of the middle class.

The expression of concern about the reforms introduced by the East India Company in Scotland can be seen as a reflection of a growing awareness in the north of Britain that in future the local universities would have to take account of events taking place beyond the borders of Scotland. Up to the middle of the nineteenth century the Scottish universities had been able to concentrate on the needs of local groups, but when the graduates of these institutions found that they could no longer gain ready access to jobs in England or in the British Empire it became clear that changes would have to be implimented. In this way the northern-most institutions had to struggle with the pressure to bring their curriculum and administration in line with that offered in the south while at the same time trying to cater for the demands of the local community which wished to see a retention of the traditional form of university education. The fact that the East India Company were offering a small number of highly desirable posts what specified that the position holders were to have acquired an English type of liberal education should not lead us to assume that this was the direction of the future of the Scottish universities. Rather we ought to view the reaffirmation of the strength of the aristocratic version of university education in England as a temporary accomodation between the still powerful aristocratic section of English society and those members of the professional classes who

were destined to carry the hierarchical notions of aristocratic society into the second half of the nineteenth century for their own purposes. The ideals of aristocratic society endured in a modified form even after it had become clear that the more outdated practices of that society were doomed to extinction.

But to get back to the specific debate about the examination system proposed by Macaulay we ought to take note of an article written by Compton in which he says

> 'subsequent criticism of the competition system and the attempts made to modify it in response to experience of its operation throw a good deal of light both on mid-Victorian ideas of social hierarchy and on the contemporary conception of an imperial governing elite. The central and persistent problem here was that of the concept of a gentleman.'[50]

The institution of the new examination system by the East India Company cannot, therefore, be seen as an objective measurement of the comparative merits of the English and Scottish university systems. Compton is only partly correct when he observes that

> 'Macaulay's committee certainly did not intend to give an equal chance to all clever young men.'[51]

The regulations framed by Macaulay and his committee were a compromise between the ideals of liberal and professional education. As with most compromise solutions neither group were fully satisfied with the end result. In fact The Saturday Review of 1858 suggested that the main beneficiaries of the reform of the recruitment system into the East India Company were not the graduates of the English or the Scottish universities, but the graduates of the Irish universities. In an article on the results of the early examinations The Saturday Review reported that

> 'the English Universities only sent their third or fourth-rate men to the Examination, and these in very small numbers.'

To the cream of Oxbridge graduates the civil service of the East India Company was not such an attractive position as, for example, a college fellowship. The Saturday Review suggested that Trinity College Dublin had greatly modified its educational courses so as to prepare its graduates for the Indian examinations and the paper asked

> 'What, after all, is at present the result of recruiting the Indian Civil Service by competition instead of nomination? Simply this. We are substituting Irishmen for Scotchmen in the Civil Government of India.'[52]

To the writer of the article in The Saturday Review this was seen as a good swap. At this point we might well reflect that one of the main outcomes of the spread of the use of examinations was the growth on the emphasis on testable knowledge. It was soon realized by those putting into practice Macaulay's proposals that one could not separate the gentlemen from the rest on the basis of a written test. In the middle of the nineteenth century, however, those interested in the Scottish universities were inclined to see the lack of success of Scottish educated students as an indication of the failure of the northern sysyem on university education. In order to appreciate the reasons behind this judgment we should now turn out attention to focus on the events taking place in Scotland itself.

The Universities (Scotland) Act of 1858 in context

In March 1855 the Association for the Extension of the Scottish Universities (A.E.S.U.) formed a sub-committee to draw the attention of the Scottish M.P.s and others to the impact on the northern universities of the regulations drawn up by Macaulay. The Association published a circular in the months between the publication of the regulations for the reform of the recruitment procedure of the E.I.C. and the first sitting of the examinations in which the writer reflected that the A.E.S.U. saw the new reguations

> 'as illustrative of the inefficiency of the Scottish universities under their present constitutions, in as much as they do not afford to young men the means of qualifying themselves in the branches of education required by the Commissioners.(sic)' [53]

The Association had been formed in July 1853 by a number of Scots interested in educational matters. By the middle of April of the following year the original group had been reformed to become the A.I.E.S.U. (Association for the Improvement and Extension of the Scottish Universities). In his valuable study of the newspapers of Scotland in this era Cowan comments on the reports which followed the reformation of the Association. He notes that the vagueness of the A.I.E.S.U.s 'aspirations had disappointed many besides The Witness'.[54] In their report The Witness had remarked that

> 'Undoubtedly the increase of the professorial remuneration is one of the first and most necessary items in a scheme of university reform.'[55]

One of those in line to benefit from any increase in the remuneration of the professors in the universities was James S. Blackie who in a letter to The Scotsman said

> 'The grand reason why all higher education is at present neglected in Scotland is plainly this - that there is no demand for it.' [56]

He went on to suggest that the universities should be provided with the resources to create a learned class in Scotland. However Blackie cannot be regarded as a typicial member of the Scottish professoriate. He was a Professor of Greek in a university system that regarded the classics as tangential to the mainstream of academic activity. Hanham describes Blackie as an 'eccentric and celtophile' [57] while Cowan concludes that he 'had scant acceptance in academic circles.' [58] This may well have been true, but outside of the universities he had some influence. Anderson sees Blackie as 'one of the best known men in Scotland'; he continues

> 'Blackie's tartan trousers and plaid, his wide-brimmed hat and flowing locks, were a startling change from the clerical austerity of orthodox professors.' [59]

Although Blackie may have been a good publicist for the cause of the A.I.E.S.U. the mainstay of the organization and its intellectual figurehead was James Lorimer. Unlike the majority of the members of the Association Lorimer was not a professor - he was a none too successful advocate and holder of a sinecure as Lyon's-Clerk. However as Joint Secretary of the A.I.E.S.U. he seems to have been the person most actively involved in putting the views of the members of the Association before the public. He was a regular contributor to the letter columns of the newspapers of both Scotland and England. He made his mark in Scotland, in the opinion of the Dictionary of National Biography, with his essay on 'The Universities of Scotland: Past, Present and Future'. Drawing on his experience of being educated in Edinburgh, Berlin, Bonn and Geneva Lorimer produced a pamphlet that was widely acclaimed in Scotland. Davie makes the interesting observation that this 'memorial volume' provided the basis for the A.I.E.S.U. policy and that, furthermore, the pamphlet owed something to a report produced by the Faculty of Advocates which

contained similar suggestions for reform; in this way the pamphlet can be seen as a presentation of the views of the legal profession.

The theme of the work was that Lorimer wished to see the universities take an active role in the creation of a 'learned class' such as existed in England. Towards this end Lorimer advocated 'the extension of the suffrage to the Scottish universities, on the same principle on which it is held by the ancient Universities of England'; the adoption of a continental system of Patronage, as described by Sir William Hamilton, which would consist 'of a board of trustees specially constituted for the purpose'; 'a change in the constitution of the universities, by which Graduates should be permitted to take part in their Government' as in the University of London; 'the formation of one board of examiners for the whole of the country, similar to that which constitutes the University of London'; 'that graduation in Arts be required for the Church and the Bar';[60] that candidates for medical degrees should take the whole curriculum of Arts, and be examined on that course before they commence their medical studies.

Finally, Lorimer expressed the opinion that one of the leading defects of the Scottish universities was that when the students left the lecture-room they were totally isolated from other students. He, therefore, suggested that junior professors, or tutors, should be appointed to organise face-to-face sessions and that the Scottish universities should adopt the English practice of a College table where professors, tutors and students could mix.

In the conclusion to his analysis of the reform needed in the Scottish universities Lorimer drew attention to the fact that all the reforms he suggested 'presupposed the existence of increased endowments'.

An interesting and illuminating comment appears in Lorimer's pamphlet. Having expressed the opinion that he wished the universities to take an active role in creating a 'learned class' such as existed in England he then points out that

> 'In England, the learned class is the clergy; with us, partly as a result of our Church holding out no direct inducements to recondite learning, either in the shape of affluent leisure, or of high preferments attainable by its means, but most of all we believe, for the much better reason of the clergy devoting almost their whole energies to the discharge of the strictly ministerial duties of their sacred calling, such is not the case, and the function thus abandoned by the Church, in so far as it has been performed at all, has fallen to the Bar.'

Having put forward this idea Lorimer follows it up by suggesting that

> 'In Scotland, for centuries, the Bar has been regarded as the great intellectual club of the country; and latterly, since its political importance as a profession has diminished, and the clergy have withdrawn themselves more entirely from secular avocations, it has partaken of this character even more than formerly.'[61]

Clearly these points are of some significance to the furtherance of our understanding of the Scottish university reform movement. Lorimer is quite explicit in saying that the 'learned class' once created should be based in Edinburgh. Glasgow and her university seem not to figure in Lorimer's plans. When we remind ourselves that previously we have noted that Edinburgh was associated with the professional wing of the middle class while Glasgow was connected with the mercantile class it seems likely that we can assume that Lorimer and his association were speaking mainly for the professional class and not, as Davie argues, for a united Scotland.

Support for this interpretation of these matters can be found by reference to Lorimer's own words. In a pamphlet published in 1858 Lorimer draws a distinction between the professions and other trades on the grounds that the professions take into account higher and wider considerations than other trades. He says

> 'it is in the presence of something like this absolute manner of regarding it, quite as much as in the nature of the occupation itself, that the distinction between a profession and a trade consists, and it is in communicating this, the properly speaking professional, as opposed to the mercantile habit of mind, that the university finds her highest and most essential vocation.'[62]

In his recently published work on 'Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland' Robert Anderson supports this interpretation of the aims of Lorimer and his association. He points out that the legal profession dominated the A.I.E.S.U. -

> 'of ninety-five General Committee members in 1853 some sixty were judges, sheriffs, advocates, or solicitors, and there were only six 'merchants' and three ministers.'[63]

One can only agree with Anderson when he goes on to summarise the situation by saying

> 'Lorimer and his Association had practically ignored science, and had recognized contemporary social change only in the negative desire to distance the professions from the 'mercantile spirit.'[64]

But let us return to the passage of events in the 1850s. The publication of Lorimer's book and the Indian Civil Service reforms both worked to increase the pressure for Scottish university reform.

In a letter to the Lord Provost in October 1855 Lorimer said

> 'I believe that, hitherto, the only real obstacle which has hindered the improvement of our higher educational institutions has been the want of any wide-spread conviction of its necessity . . . .if the harvest has been scanty no one need wonder. That, in so far as Scotland is concerned, it has been scanty indeed, the recent examination of the India Civil Service has proved but too conclusively.'[65]

In his study of this period of Scottish university history Professor Horn indicates that Lorimer was involved in the drafting of 'a bill to give effect to some of the reforms advocated by the Association'. The pressure for reform was sustained by the Scottish Literary Institute which sent a deputation to London in the summer of 1857 to visit the Lord Advocate, the Rt Hon James Moncrieff.

In describing these events Horn says that Moncrieff told the deputation that

> 'he had "at the beginning of the session" submitted a Bill to government dealing at least with some parts of the question of university reform. From financial and other considerations, it was found not expedient to press it at present.'[66]

The other considerations referred to by Moncrieff were the preoccupation of parliament and the country at large with the shock occasioned by the Indian Mutiny of that year. It was readily accepted by those pressing for the reform of the universities that the government should be allowed to shelve the matter while the traumatic events in India unfolded.

Horn takes the view that Lorimer and the A.I.E.S.U. were 'encouraged' by Moncrieff's attitude and interest. The Association held their Annual General Meeting in Edinburgh in November 1857 and decided to try to convince the government of the need for action on the reforms by holding a great public meeting the next month.

In his account of this meeting Horn draws attention to the fact that most of those who took part in getting the 1858 Bill through Parliament were in attendence. The Scotsman reported that the hall was 'completely crowded by a large and enthusiastic audience.'[67]

The Rt Hon Lord Campbell, the Lord Chief Justice of England, presided over the meeting and spoke at some length. In his speech he disassociated himself from the 'language' of his 'friend' Professor Blackie and then commenced to put forward his own ideas. The Times reported Campbell as saying

> 'it will be necessary to make an application to Parliament . . . This is a national object, and to a national object the national revenue may be properly applied . . .'[68]

Two days after The Times report was published that newspaper published a Leading Article which poured scorn on the ambitions of the A.I.E.S.U. The leader stated

> 'The Scotch Universities are suddenly seized with a noble ambition. They are resolved that they should henceforth be places of higher education. . in a word, the Scotch Universities will be English Universities and Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen and St Andrews will be as Oxford and Cambridge . . . Now if the Scotch Universities can succeed in this new aim . . . they will cease to be national places of education in the sense of educating the masses. .

> When a Scotch University becomes a place of higher education, it ipso facto becomes a place for the education of the few . . .' [69]

The Scotsman was quickly to the defence of the Association when it referred to 'the labouriously flippant article' of The Times. It continued

> 'This absurd tirade might have been passed over with silent contempt but for the fallacy which lies at the bottom of it, that popular seminaries of education - seminaries accessible to the masses - must of necessity bestow on their alumni a mere shallow and coarse smattering of knowledge. The Scotch Universities are a remarkable illustration of the hollowness of this fallacy . . .' [70]

Hanham, in an Introduction to Buckle's work on Scotland, throws an interesting side-light on this public debate when he observes that The Times had

> 'assumed a markedly anti-Scottish tone about the time of the Dissruption and had become a permanent and intellectually distinguished critic of Scottish life and letters'. [71]

In the House of Commons on the 16th February, 1858 Lord Advocate Moncrieff, in answer to a question from Lord Elcho, stated that he had a draft Bill ready and that it would be introduced as soon as possible. Three days later the government of Viscount Palmerston was defeated on a vote in the House of Commons; the government resigned. The Tory Earl of Derby replaced the liberal Palmerston and Moncrieff was replaced by John Inglis as Lord Advocate.

Inglis was a Vice-President of the A.I.E.S.U. and proceeded to act rapidly to bring in the reforms that the Association had been talking about for some years. In his introductory speech to his Bill in April, 1858 Inglis referred to the fact that Moncrieff had provided him with a copy of the draft Bill drawn up by the previous administration. A comparison of the Moncrieff and Inglis Bills supports Horn's view that Inglis grossly exaggerated his 'indebtedness to his predecessors draft Bill'. Horn says

> 'Lord Advocate Moncrieff's Bill bore little relation to the Act of 1858. It was in fact as well as in name merely "An Act to enable Her Majesty to grant Additional Endowments to the Universities and Colleges of Scotland" . . . . There were no provisions concerning the constitutions of the Universities and no suggestion of an Executive Commission to carry out, in accordance with Parliaments wishes, the detailed reorganization of the Universities'.[72]

The main innovation in Inglis's Bill was the plan to institute a 'University Board' to improve the administration of each university. These boards were to be composed of the Rector, the Principal and a further individual, called an Assessor, who was to be nominated by the Professors and the Graduates.

Grants tells us that

> 'The debate on the Bill showed a remarkable unanimity in its favour on the part of all the Scotch representatives. There were only two points on which any opposition was made to the proposals of the Lord Advocate. The two members for Edinburgh wished to preserve the government of their University in the hands of the Town

> Council, and the members for Aberdeen opposed the amalgamation not of the two Aberdeen Universities, but of King's and Marischal Colleges . . .'[73]

In spite of adverse criticism and much debate in both Houses the Bill was eventually enacted in August 1858. The preamble to the Bill specified its provisions under three headings

> 'to make provision for the better Government and Discipline of the Universities of Scotland, and imposing and regulating the course of study therein, and for the Union of the Two Universities and Colleges of Aberdeen.'[74]

The Act gave the Commissioners the authority to revise endowments, to raise salaries and to provide new professorships and assistantships. To finance these reforms the Commissioners were given an £10,000 annual grant. The Act provided for some detailed alterations in the system of university government. The courts were to control the distribution of patronage and were to consist of representatives of the students, the professors and the graduates. The Senates retained the power to administer the revenues and property of the universities.

The Act did not lay down any restrictions or guidelines as to the exact nature of the changes required in the courses of study. Instead the Commissioners were expected to institute curriculum reforms through the passage of ordinances.

Of the eleven Commissioners ten were Scots. The one Englishman, Lord Stanhope, resigned his place on the grounds that he found it inconvenient to travel to Edinburgh for the sittings of the enquiry. He was replaced by a Scot, the Earl of Haddington. The only survivor of the 1826 Commission in the ranks of the new Executive Commission was the Earl of Aberdeen. However ill-health prevented him from attending any of the meetings. The remainder of the Commissioners

got down to work straight-away. This Commission differed from that of 1826 in that it had a significant number of M.P.s in its ranks. However the fact that the Commission was doing its work in Edinburgh prevented most of those M.P.s from attending on a regular basis. Out of the one hundred and twenty-six meetings of the Commission the M.P. for Greenock, Alexander Murray Dunlop, attended thirty-eight; the recently deposed M.P. for Glasgow, Alexander Hastie, attended fifty-six sittings; Sir William Stirling Maxwell, the M.P. for Perthshire, went to forty-one meetings; the Rt Hon James Moncrieff, the Member for Leith District, took up his appointment as Lord Advocate and only managed to get to thirty-five meetings of the Commission.

In contrast to these poor attenders were the Edinburgh-based members of the Scottish legal profession who made up the other important group of Commissioners. The Chairman, John Inglis, only missed one meeting. The lawyer W. Gibson Craig only missed ten meetings and Crauford, one of the Lords of the Court of Sessions, only missed fourteen meetings. The President of the Court of Sessions, the Rt Hon Duncan McNeill, sat as a Commissioner one hundred and one times.

In his comments on the composition of the Executive Commission of 1858 Anderson notes that it

> 'was composed of lawyers, peers, and M.P.s, but the universities themselves had no representatives. Nor did the churches - an indication of how the Disruption had weakened their influence over public affairs.'[75]

In his section on 'Lorimer and the 1858 Commission' Davie does not criticize the composition of this particular Commission; as we will see he seems to approve of the work of the Commissioners. Furniss, who's comments on the 1826 Commission were referred to in the last chapter, ignores entirely this Executive Commission.

So Although the Commission of 1858 differed in its composition from that of 1826 one feature clearly remained unchanged; once again the Edinbugh-based legal profession dominated the proceedings.

The Commission sat until December 1862. A comparison of the composition of this Scottish Commission with those that were formed to enquire into the affairs of Oxford and Cambridge reveals certain features that are worth noting. In the first place the Scottish Commission was much larger in number than either the Oxford or Cambridge Commissions, but the latter two Commissions were much better attended. It seems likely that these two facts are related; the government might well have anticipated that a Commission sitting in Edinburgh would be less well attended than one sitting in London and, therefore, it may have decided that the best way to maintain a quorum was to appoint more Commissioners and to place an emphasis on appointing Edinburgh residents.

Secondly, the Oxford and Cambridge Commissions were composed of a much more limited cross-section of the community than that dealing with the Scottish universities. The social composition of the two English Commissions reflected nothing more than an academic or clerical bias while the Scottish Commision drew on representatives of the aristocracy, the professions and commercial interests.

In his chapter on the mid-century period Davie says

> 'The recommendations promulgated by Lord Predident Inglis and his fellow-commissioners clearly favoured the traditionalist party and Lorimer's Association on the question of how Scottish education was to be managed. Indeed, their report - at least in the central section already mentioned - constituted a considered retort to the prejudices which had inspired their predecessors, the Commissioners of 1830 . . . . . the men of 1858 had no bias in favour

> of classics, but instead recognised the value of a tradition of general education which gave the chief place to philosophy and science. So too, they were not shocked by the open-door policy and the uncouthness it led to, but were proud of the 'lads o' pairts' and the opportunities provided for them.'[76]

However, the Commissioners failed to persuade the Government to provide the funds necessary to carry out their plans. The reason for this were never made clear. In England the practice was for the government to refrain from interferring in the financial affairs of the universities and this notion might have been applied to the northern universities. John Inglis, the chairman of the Commission of Inquiry, in a speech at a public dinner four years after the expiration of the Commission, told a university audience

> "Put not your trust in the hands of the Treasury". The strings of the public purse are not silken cords - they seem to be more like chain cables - which it would take the strength of a giant . . . to untie.'[77]

Whatever may have been the case Davie correctly notes that the Commissioners final Report

> 'did not make any reference to the projects for expansion, but consisted largely of a defence of the status quo, against anglicising criticisms.'

Davie contrasts the treatment the Scottish universities received with that given to the English and Irish universities. He says that when the Commissioners urged the government to provide the funds for the expansion of the Scottish universities they pointed to 'the precedent of the official favour enjoyed by the English and Irish Universities';

he concludes that the rejection of these plans by both the Government and Opposition arose out of the fact that they were both against

> 'subsidising the Scottish education system so long as it remained virtually independent and attached to un-British standards'.[78]

Davie's interpretation of the reason for the lack of funds for the Scottish universities is not backed up with any clear evidence. A study of both political parties statements on the question of financing university education in this period reveals that the general policy was to avoid giving state aid to universities. The fact that Oxford and Cambridge were able to take an independent line on this question was, no doubt, an influential factor. So long as these two universities found that they could prosper on the incomes derived from their large endowments they were able to take the line that the acceptance of state aid would lead to the danger of the state feeling it could interfer in university affairs. The newly established civic universities were the victim of this policy; even though they invited government aid they had to wait until 1889 before a reform of the no-aid policy came about. Armytage points out that the first of the civic universities, Owens College in Manchester, had applied for state aid soon after its foundation but that

> 'the policy of giving direct state aid to the university colleges, though mooted, was never entertained. In November 1852, Owen's College had applied for a grant, and a deputation was received at Whitehall . . . but nothing was done'.[79]

The financial assistance that the University of London received and the support for the Irish Universities were exceptions to the

general rule of self-help that arose out of the all powerful doctrine of 'laissez-faire.'

The only support of any kind that Davie offers to substantiate his hypothesis that the Scottish universities were being treated unfairly was by quoting from a speech made by the Principal of the University of Edinburgh at the beginning of the 1864-5 session. The Principal, Sir David Brewster, the famous scientist, told his students that a group of patriotic individuals had pressurised the government into appointing the Royal Commission and that it had been widely anticipated that those Commissioners would be able to persuade the government to provide financial assistance for the universities of Scotland. Brewster said

> 'At a time when the exigencies of war made no demand upon the national resources, and when the finances of the country were in the most prosperous condition, a liberal measure of University reform was confidently anticipated. These hopes, however, were disappointed'.[80]

In the 1961 edition of his book Davie had continued Brewster's quotation in the following way

> 'The members of the legislature had no difficulty in obtaining from the Government £800,000 annually for the education of classes represented in Parliament (i.e. for the Colleges where the upper classes were educated - i.e. England and Ireland) while the Universities of Scotland were unsuccessful supplicants for the generousity of the state'.[81]

The words in the brackets in this quotation were not in the speech made by Brewster as recorded in the pamphlet published soon after his address; one can only assume they were inserted by Davie. In the 1981 revised edition of his book the quotation from Brewster's speech was

retained but the words in brackets were omitted, It would appear that Davie may have realized his mistake; Brewster was not referring to grants made to 'colleges'. Rather he was drawing attention to the fact that the Westminster parliament voted £800,000 to support elementary education in England. This very sum was mentioned by Simon when he noted that

> 'Sound and cheap elementary instruction had been the aim set before the Newcastle Commission . . . In 1861 the Treasury grant had topped £800,000, but four years later Mr Gladstone was only called upon to dispurse some £600,000 towards the education of worker's children.' [82]

The words of Brewster on the question of the State financing of the universities should be seen in terms of a wider set of factors than Davie acknowledges. Brewster was not so concerned with the financing of the Scottish universities as he was with the financing of science within all the universities of Britain.

Although Brewster had been one of the main instigators of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in the early 1830s it should not be assumed that he ever accepted the English 'gentlemanly' ideals of those who dominated the early years of that association. In their study of the B.A.A.S. between 1830 and 1844 Morrell and Thackray identified twenty-three central figures and office-holders of the association and described this 'inner core' in their book on the 'Gentlemen of Science'. Morrell and Thackray point out that the 'inner core' were based in the English provinces and had many links with Trinity College, Cambridge. These authors say

> 'The Gentlemen of Science were not concerned with science in the modern professional sence of knowledge as a means of livelihood.

> Their interest was rather with science as a vocation or personal calling to those who already possessed financial security.'[83]

Morrell and Thackray indicate that these gentlemen had 'little understanding of the problems faced by those employed in Scottish universities where teaching was the dominent activity' So although Brewster may have been one of the twenty-three central figures he was 'always the odd man out.'[84]

Brewster was renowned for his writings to the effect that the universities were the last places to expect to find any kind of scientific research; he maintained that in these institutions the Professors were necessarily preoccupied with earning a living by enrolling students in their classes. Even though Brewster later became associated directly with the Scottish universities it should be clear that his plea for funds in 1864 was motivated by his interest in furthering the ends of science rather than improving his own financial prospects.

Near the end of the university address quoted by Davie this becomes clearer; after detailing some of the direct and indirect benefits derived from the study of science Brewster said

> 'I have felt it a duty to impress upon you the national value of the science taught and cultivated in our universities, and of the practical discoveries which have emanated from the universities themselves.'[85]

It seems likely that Brewster was trying to encourage the government to support science in the universities and not complaining

about the unfair treatment of the Scottish universities as Davie seems to imply. After all Brewster had devoted his time to a British Association rather than a Scottish one.

It seems likely that the reason that the government declined to finance the recommendations of the Scottish Executive Commission was that the government were against the idea of state aid for universities. To suggest that because the state provided support for elementary education in England that it should assist tertiary education in Scotland misses the significantpoint that English ideas about the role of the universities in society procluded such a possibility. In so far as Davie suggests that the Scottish universities suffered at the hands of the English because the English failed to see that their ideas were different from the Scots he is quite correct. But he seems to go too far when he gives the impression that the English were actively anti-Scottish. In a country where the universities were still seen as the exclusive preserve of the 'upper classes' it would have been politically impossible for any administration in Westminster to divert money away from elementary education towards tertiary education. The fact that the Scots might regard their universities as part and parcel of a national system of education at a time when the English had yet to establish the links between the primary and tertiary sectors must be noted and taken account of.

Summary

The links between the church and the state and the educational context can be seen to be of continuing importance to our study.

Before connecting the events of the mid-century period to the changes taking place in the relative positions of the aristocratic, professional and mercantile classes we need to consider the associated point concerning the relationship of the church and the state. We can use as our starting point the fact raised by Anderson that the 1858 Commission contained no representatives of the churches and that this was an 'indication of how the Disruption had weakened their influence over public affairs.'

The importance of this (and the contrast with the influence of the cleric in the south) becomes clear when we compare the composition of the 1858 Commission on the Scottish universities with those that were appointed to investigate Oxford and Cambridge. Both of these Commissions were lead by bishops and contained a disproportionate number of clerics. This confirms that an enduring feature of the English universities as compared with their northern counterparts is that they were much more closely connected to the church than those in Scotland.

A further difference between the university systems had been that the institutions in the north accepted state interference while those in the south strove to retain their independence from the state. Disraeli's warning to Gladstone that he would have much to answer for if he placed the English universities under the control of the state would not have carried so much menace if applied to the Scottish universities. The contrasts between the two systems can be stated in terms of the universities relation to outside powers. In Scotland the universities wanted to retain close links with the state, but were not so concerned about the links with the church as their southern counterparts. Whereas in England the universities were

very resistant to state interference and regarded their links with the Church of England as very important.

The other theme we must now consider is the impact of the struggle of the contending interest groups on the universities. At this point it is appropriate to consider some general points about those groups so as to assist us in reaching a fuller understanding of the educational milieu. For example, a number of historians of this period refer to the rise in the status of the professional classes. In his work on Cambridge University Sheldon Rothblatt notes that

> 'an unprecedented expansion in the numbers and prosperity of professional men occured in the period 1850-1870.'[86]

and claims that this expansion on the numbers attending the universities. Rothblatt observes that the ranks of professional men had been swollen by the inclusion of senior civil servants, solicitors and graduate engineers. With regard to Cambridge he concludes

> 'Dons could promote professionalism and professional occupations confident in the knowledge that sufficient positions existed. They could allow increases in the numbers of students matriculating at Cambridge without undue fear that they were about to produce a superfluous intelligentsia.'[87]

One of the interesting little twists in the debate about the connections between the reform of the universities and the professions at this time was that the university Dons and Professors who played a central role in the discussions were at the same time interested in including their own occupation in the ranks of the professions.

At Oxford and Cambridge the teachers suffered socially in that

they could not aspire to the same status as their aristocratic pupils. In the middle of the century this state of affairs underwent some change as the status of the academic profession rose. In his history of the Association of University Teachers Perkin traces the source of the resurrection of the academic back into the last century. So far as we are concerned in this thesis it is interesting to note that Perkin concludes that

> 'the Scottish universities preserved enough of the medieval tradition of the academic profession to be the main channel of its revival in the nineteenth century.'[88]

A cynic might put forward the idea that Blackie's statements on the need for further endowments of chairs in the Scottish universities, and the words of Lorimer on the advantages to be gained by the creation of a learned class in Scotland, were but thinly veiled attempts to look after the interests of the academic profession in Scotland and not attempts to improve the universities as such.

Nevertheless we ought to be sure of one point- the academic profession on both sides of the border would have supported the idea that professional education should form part of the curriculum in the universities. A more detailed look at some of the writings of Lorimer can be used to confirm his interest in furthering the ends of professional studies. In an article in the Edinburgh Review of 1858 Lorimer suggested that

> 'The Professions in this country, and not the Civil Service in India, are the proper objects of our national universities, both Scotch and English.'[89]

Later in the same paper Lorimer made it clear that just as he was against the idea that scientific and technical education should form part of the curriculum he was also opposed to the plan that the

university should concern itself with what might be described as an English-style liberal education. In his opinion a balance should be maintained - he said

> 'But if the university relinquishes her academic character in one direction by condescending to impart mere practical skill, she does so no less flagrantly when she undertakes to convey mere general knowledge and accomplishment.'[90]

As a spokesman for the traditional values of the Scottish universities Lorimer can be seen to be saying that in the conflict between the various demands on the university curriculum a resolution should be achieved that would allow the universities to retain their emphasis on professional education.

Although certain aspects in the reforming of the English universities and the changes in the recruitment procedure of the Indian Civil Service indicated that the southern version of liberal education was under attack we can see that this attack was beaten off. The main advocates of reform, in the professional class, managed to force a rethink on the aims of university education in England, but were unable to get their own ideas accepted by those who were in a position to undertake the necessary reforms.

In the compromises reached between the various groups in this period it appears that some ideas originally associated with the professional class were incorporated into the new consensus on higher education, but only when those aspects were not a direct threat to the central tenets of the more traditional liberal education view. For example, there was no compromise on the idea that a university education should produce 'gentlemen' even though the definition of a gentlemen was widened to include some groups who worked for a living. It became important to the professional class to associate themselves with the gentlemanly ideal so as to be able to distance themselves from the mercantile classes. As the

professional classes worked to establish an ethos which emphasised the idea of service to the community over and above the notion of working for money that class were able to tread a narrow path between the aristocratic ideal and the lower status ideas of work for gain that were linked with the mercantile wing of the middle class.

With the expansion of the professions beyond the traditional bounds of the three learned professions a closer control had to be taken over the entry into the professions. The newer professions solved this difficulty by setting entrance examinations for new recruits. In this way the newer professions sought to emphasis their superiority over other occupational groups. But this use of examinations meant that a barrier was erected between the aristocratic ideal and the professional ideal. For traditionally aristocratic status could never be achieved, but could only be ascribed. This clashed with the professional classes emphasis on achievement. In his article on the introduction of the examination system into Oxford and Cambridge Rothblatt draws attention to some of the contradictions involved in marriage of old liberal education ideas with the meritocratic ideals of the nineteenth century. In particular Rothblatt indicates that

> 'The former aristocratic belief that work was anti-social or that ambition was mainly a way of drawing invidious distinctions certainly remained in the university environment, piggy backing on the eighteenth century theory of liberal education and giving legitimacy to what otherwise would be dismissed as mere indolence. When Newman was at Oriel in 1817 he was insulted by his peers for conduct not befitting a gentleman simply because he studied too much.'[91]

Seen in this light the central forces for change in the mid-century period can be viewed as a result of the compromises reached between the aristocratic and professional classes. And hence Macaulay's emphasis on the idea of liberal education in the examinations for

the Indian Civil Service should be set in a context where status had to be achieved. The very notion of testing individuals clearly owed more to the professional ethos than to the aristocratic. In England the aristocratic idea still dominated the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, but other ideas were incorporated which came from notions associated with the professional classes. In Scotland the professional groups were the more powerful partner in the alliance with the aristocratic class. The status of the aristocratic ideas were used by that group to distinguish themselves from the mercantile class. The time of the mercantile section of the middle class had not yet come.

Chapter Five

The Scottish Universities Commissions of 1876 and 1889 and the development of a two-tier University System in England

In the study of the last quarter of the century we can give our attention to the continuing saga of university reform in Scotland and contrast that with the different and separate response in England to similar pressures on the university system.

In this section the aim will be to chronicle the many changes taking place in England with the founding of a string of civic universities in the industrial towns and to see how they connected with, or provided an alternative to, the existing universities. These developments will be contrasted with those in Scotland. The overall intention of this chapter is to account for the various responses to the changes in British society that influenced university affairs.

But before we begin to investigate the repercussions of those changes we ought to take note of the context of British internal affairs as they stood at the beginning of the 1870s. In the middle of the 1860s the commercial class and the working class trade union movement came together to put pressure on parliament to widen the franchise. When the 1866 Reform Bill introduced by Lord John Russell was defeated a mass demonstration was held in Hyde Park to express frustration at the tactics of the Tories. Although Disraeli came to power as a consequence of the defeat of Russell's Bill when in power the Tories found the pressure to introduce their own measure on electoral reform irresistible. In its passage through parliament the Bill introduced by Disraeli's government was amended to form the Reform Act of 1867. This Act enfranchised a much wider electorate than the Tories had originally intended. While the working class had been the most influential pressure

group working for reform they were not the main beneficiaries of the Act. In his study of the making of the second Reform Bill Smith expresses the opinion that it was paradoxical that

> 'the commercial men should profit by the enfranchisement of the lower orders.'

Smith maintains that the 1867 Act

> 'broke the age-old rural bias of Parliament and brought the representative system into conformity with the realities of the nineteenth century. The elections of 1868, 1874 and 1880 added to the numbers of ambitious 'commercial men' in the House, at the expense of the country gentlemen.'[1]

The increased representation of the mercantile class in parliament meant that the polite tête-à-tête between the aristocratic and professional classes on university matters that we have seen was a feature of the debate in the earlier part of the century was interrupted by the mercantile class who found that they could exert some direct influence on the political front.

In this chapter we will need to examine the way in which the mercantile class used that increased influence to contribute to the reform of the universities. In particular we will have to examine the links between the extension of scientific and technological studies in the universities and the question of the financing of those institutions.

The Scottish University Commission of 1876

In the last chapter we considered the events in Scotland in the 1850s. When the 1858 Executive Commission on the Scottish Universities powers expired, in 1862, there followed a period of relative peace and stability in the four northern universities.

The 1860s were, however, a period of increasing political agitation in both England and Scotland. The mid-century period of unstable cabinets was being replaced by a strengthening of the political cleavages between the Conservatives, under Benjamin Disraeli, and the Liberals headed by William Gladstone. Street demonstrations for electoral reform were successful in so far as the 1867 Reform Act was passed which extended the franchise to the lower middle class and the better off workers. The Act further redistributed parliamentary seats in favour of the growing urban industrial centres.

In addition to this political reform the pace of educational reform increased. In England the Newcastle Commission had been set up to look into the state of secondary education. At the end of its enquiry it came out with the recommendation of the introduction of the Revised Code. Under this code teachers were to be subject to control through the implimentation of a system of 'payments by results.'

An ill-informed government assumed that the recommendations of the Newcastle Commission could be implemented in Scotland. When the Code was introduced their was an outcry because it was felt that the Scottish educational system differed significantly from the system in England. During the previous century the Scots had developed a network of parochial schools that served the small market towns of the lowlands. In their day these schools had been so successful that they gained an

international reputation for their comprehensive intake.

The government were forced to recognise the differences between the Scottish and English systems and, hence, the Argyll Commission was appointed in 1865 to make recommendations on the Scottish system. The Commission found that the parochial schools in Scotland had many distinctive qualities but concluded that these schools were ill-equipped to deal with the requirements of the new industrial age.

And so soon after the passage of the English Education Act of 1870 followed the Scottish Education Act in 1872. While these Acts differed in some points of detail the Scottish Act closely copied the English legislation. One of the most significant aspects of the Scottish Act was that it set up a Scottish Education Department to administer its provisions. Lyon Playfair, the Liberal Member of Parliament for the Universities of Edinburgh and St Andrews, spoke out against certain clauses of the Act. In particular he wanted to see the newly-established Education Department to be based in Edinburgh rather than in London. Even though he failed in that aim Myers suggests that it was Playfair

> 'who emerged . . . as the ablest parliamentary spokesman on behalf of the Scottish tradition.'[2]

It was in relation to these events that Duncan MacGilivray said

> 'There can be no doubt that this period of tutelage to England resulted in grave educational loss to Scotland. In 1872, England was at least a generation behind Scotland in its educational ideals and practices. Yet it was English ideals, English standards, English classifications which ruled Scotland for more than a decade.'[3]

Davie, in his study of the Scottish universities in the nineteenth-century, quotes this section by MacGilivray and tries to connect it

the reform of the secondary schools with the investigations into the reform of the universities, without really establishing that MacGilvray's comments were applicable to those institutions.

The first indication that the second administration of Benjamin Disraeli intended to take any action with regard to the reforming of the Scottish universities came in the speech by the Earl of Derby on the occasion of his inauguration as Lord Rector of the University of Edinburgh in December, 1875.

The Scotsman greeted the news with the neutral comment that

> 'It is at any rate satisfactory that the whole subject of University education is to be re-opened'.[4]

In April 1876 The Times announced that the Queen had given her consent to a Royal Commission

> 'to inquire into various matters connected with the Universities of Scotland'.[5]

In fact the Commissioners powers in inquiry were wider-ranging, but at the same time quite specific. They were asked to enquire into

> 'The constitution and powers of the University Court; the functions of the Great Council; the course of study and regulations for graduation in the faculties of Arts, Medicine, Law and Divinity; the expediency of instituting any new facilities or degrees; the institution or continuence of entrance examinations; the creation of new professorships or lectureships; the provision of assistance and apparatus for any present or future Professors or Lecturers; the length of the University sessions, and the expediency of introducing any changes in respect

> of these; the regognition of extra-mural teaching and the conditions under which such teaching should be recognised; regulations as to time, place right and manner of presenting and electing all University officers; the emoluments and retiring allowances of Principals, Professors and Lecturers; the mode of appointment to bursaries, scholarships, fellowships and other similar foundations and the conditions of their tenure; the financial position of the Universities, and the administration of their property and revenues; the condition of the University buildings, libraries, and museums and the provision of their management, maintenance and extension'.[6]

The issuing of this Commission should be seen in context. In his article on 'Scotland and the Conservative Party in 1876' Crapster suggests that in an attempt to over-come the continuous lack of electoral success of the Conservative party in Scotland Disraeli's ministry of 1874 - 80 was 'uncommonly attentive to Scottish affairs'.[7] Crapster goes on to say that the Reform Act of 1867 encouraged the Conservatives to think that they could break the complete domination of the Liberals in Scotland. In the election of 1874 Disraeli's party had won only nineteen of the sixty Scottish seats, whereas in England they had enjoyed a sweeping electoral victory. Even this performance was an improvement over the seven Scottish seats they had won in the 1868 election.

Thus the Commission was issued at a time when the Conservative party were trying to make a conscious effort to break the Liberal stronghold on Scottish politics. Hanham points out, in his book on politics in the time of Disraeli and Gladstone, that the Conservative Party Central office appointed a committee to go into the matter of improving the parties performance in Scotland. Hanham concludes that

> 'The result was a gradual increase in the number of constituencies contested (21 in 1868, 37 in 1874 and 42 in 1880) and a general improvement of Conservative morale.'[8]

From these studies we may conclude that it seems likely that the issuing of the 1876 Commission was part of an attempt by the Conservatives to court political popularity in Scotland by giving attention to Scottish problems. Davie's contention that the Commission was another attack upon Scottish educational practices does not seem to tie in with these authors interpretations.

At the head of the list of Commissioners was again the name of John Inglis, now Lord Glencorse, who had also headed the 1858 enquiry. Inglis was supported by a number of high-ranking Conservatives such as the Duke of Buccleauch and Queensbury, James Crauford, William Watson and Archibald Campbell Swinton. These last three were Scottish lawyers. Of the twelve Commissioners nine were Scots and another was born in England, but raised and educated in Scotland. The two others (Huxley and Froud) were English.

John Watt, in his biography of Inglis, suggests that the Commission was appointed 'in answer to the obtrusive demands of science and utilitarianism' and notes that 'the work and constitution of the Commission were different from those which marked its precursers . .' in that 'the investigations were largelyinfluenced by the representation of science.'[9] Davie refers to this biography and quotes Watt's declaration that

> 'it is a fact that Inglis was rarely present at their inquires'. It is not known, the biographer proceeds, why Inglis did not bother with this Commission and left the burden of the presidency to his deputy and legal rival Moncrieff . .'[10]

The extensive minutes of the 1876 Commission cover seventy-two out

out of the ninety-three meetings that the Commissioners held. The last twenty-one meetings were not concerned with taking evidence and, therefore, the minutes were not published. From the records of the meetings for which the minutes were published it can be seen that Watt's declaration as to Inglis's involvement was ill-informed. Inglis attended sixty-five of those seventy-two meetings and sat as Chairman for fifty-nine out of a possible sixty-five times. In contrast Moncreiff only attended nineteen meetings and never sat as Chairman.

The matter of Inglis's involvement with the Scottish Universities Commission of 1876 was covered in one paragraph of Watts' biography. The only hint of a dissenting note by Inglis was Watt's comment that

> 'Probably owing to its over-scientific colour the recommendation of this Commission did not meet with the general approval of the public and certainly they have very little fruit'.[11]

Nowhere does Watt imply that Inglis was opposed to the conclusions of the Commissioners or that he wished to submit a minority report. It would appear therefore, that Davie is unjustified in saying

> 'it is implied, sensibly enough, that Inglis had no sympathy with the official trend towards complete specialization'.

or that Inglis

> 'had perhaps even begun to regard the cause of Scottish independence in education as a lost or hopeless one'.[12]

Davie's speculations on this point are unsupported by any solid evidence. The only way in which these contentions would begin to hold water is if Davie were to argue that 'over-scientific colour' and his notion of

'complete specialization' amounted to the same thing and that a scientific approach was the antithesis of the traditional Scottish approach. The fact that the Scottish Universities had a long and important tradition of keeping abreast of scientific advances and technological changes, which went back to the eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth century, suggests that Davie would have difficulty in arguing along these lines.

In his chapter on this period Davie goes to some lengths to support his contention that the Commission 'came down solidly on the side of pro-English policy'. To reinforce his argument that this reform should be viewed in terms of a struggle between anglophilic/anglophobic factions he attributes certain statements to the Commissioners. He says, for example, that the Commissioners

> 'stated in the preamble that the local peculiarities of Scottish higher education should disappear'.[13]

and later he restates that

> 'in the preamble of the 1876 report it was laid down that the aim of educational development was to be assimilation to Southern standards'.[14]

Within a page of this statement he says of the Commissioners

> 'it was high time, they said in their report, that Scotland be brought into line with England educationally'[15]

Now although the published Report of the Commissioners was a bulky four-volume affair a careful study of these volumes reveals that any general policy-orientated statements such as those given above could only be found in volume one; the second and third volumes contained

the detailed minutes of evidence heard by the Commissioners and volume four was made up entirely of returns and documents submitted by the four universities for consideration by the Commissioners. A thorough search of volume one reveals that the Report does not contain a 'preamble' and that at no point did the Commissioners commit themselves to 'assimilation' or to the bringing into line of Scottish University education to English standards.

Certain members of the Scottish Commission were well-known for their contributions to the debate on the role of the universities in Victorian society. From the public pronouncements of these individuals we can clearly see that any statement in the Commissioners report to the effect that the Scottish universities should be assimilated to the standards of the English universities would have been a direct contradiction of their previous public statements.

For example, in the debate in the House of Commons on the University Education (Ireland) Bill in 1873 Lyon Playfair was reported by Hansard as saying

> 'I must at once decline to follow the Prime Minister into his mode of presenting the intellectual deficiences of Ireland to the House, because if we accepted his views of what University education is, and what it is not, I think no more serious blow could be struck at the prosperity of two poor countries like Scotland and Ireland. If the Universities in these countries are to be upheld merely or chiefly on account of their Faculties of Arts and if academic productiveness be measured by their Arts degrees, and not at all by their success in training men for professional and industrial life, you may as well give them up altogether as institutions for national amelioration'[16]

If the Final Report of the 1876 Commission had contained the statements Davie attributes to it we may think that Playfair and Huxley would have felt compelled to submit a minority report setting out their dissent from such a conclusion. No such minority reports are to be found in the published volumes.

This is not the only example of a lack of clarity in Davie's chapter on the events of the 1870s and 1880s. In her article on 'Nineteenth Century Scottish Nationalism: the cultural background' Rosalind Mitchison says of the same chapter

> 'I find some difficulty in relating his comments to the material in the Report. There is, for instance, considerable distance between Davie's statement that the Commission wished 'the old general degree to be virtually abolished' and the statement in the Report, 'The candidate for a degree in Arts should be allowed to proceed in the present course, if he please, and as, no doubt, many will still do.'[17]

But to return to the point as to the anglophil nature of the Commission. In his comments about the composition of the Royal Commission Davie pursues the subject of the intentions of the Commissioners; he refers to

> 'the type of men . . . sent North by the government to settle the educational fate of the Scots - leaders of advanced opinion like Huxley, Froude and Lyon Playfair.'[18]

Davie was quite correct in pointing out that these three individuals were leaders of advanced opinion; their opinions were too advanced for the government and their specific notions on university education were, by no means, government policy in England. In these circumstances it must seem unlikely that they would

represent the government's thinging about education in Scotland. It seems more likely that these three owed their places on the Commission to their connections with the Scottish universities. Huxley had been elected the Rector of Aberdeen University in 1872; Froude had similarly been chosen by the graduates of St. Andrews University as their Rector in 1869; while Lyon Playfair was the liberal M.P. for the seat that represented Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities.

An interesting perspective on Huxley's relationship with the Scottish universities is provided by Bibby in his article on Huxley's role in the development of the universities. Bibby points out that Huxley had 'very nearly' been elected Rector of St. Andrews only a few months before his election at Aberdeen; Bibby then suggests that

> 'The detailed newspaper reports of the two rectorial election campaigns show that Huxley's candidature acted as a focus for the students discontent with ancient university ways and for their determination to press not only for adequate science teaching and the improvement of medical education, but also for university reform generally'.[19]

Seen from this perspective it seems that the implication in Davie's analysis that these anglophils were foisted onto the Scots is mistaken.

Huxley's relationship with the two old English universities was not so strong as was his relationship with the universities of Scotland. An indication of the distance between the attitudes prevalent at, for example, Oxford and those held by Huxley can be made clear by referring to the British Association debate which took place in Oxford in 1860 at which Darwinism was a major topic.

At one point in the debate the Bishop of Oxford asked Huxley if he thought he was descended from a 'venerable ape'; according to the history of the British Association written by Howarth Huxley replied

> 'If I am asked whether I would choose to be descended from the poor animal of low intelligence and stooping gait, who grins and chatters as we pass, or from a man endowed with great ability and a splendid position, who should use these gifts to discredit and crush humble seekers after truth, I hesitate what answer to make.'[20]

Morrell and Thackray in their account of the early years of the British Association suggest that the contest between Bishop Wilberforce and Huxley can be seen as an ominous warning to the 'gentlemen of science' who had originally dominated the B.A.A.S. These authors maintain that

> 'the exchange signally a growing division between the older, often clerical Gentlemen of Science, who believed in a voluntarism nourished by their financial independence, and those newer career-dependent scientists such as Huxley, who saw entrenched ecclesiastical power as a barrier to their own professional ambition.'[21]

But let us return to the chronology of the reform of the Scottish universities. A study of the attendence records of Huxley, Froude and Playfair at the meetings of the 1876 Commission reveals that these three would hardly have had the opportunity to 'settle the educational fate of the Scots' as maintained by Davie. Out of the seventy-two meetings of the Commissioners Froude attended ten,

Playfair twelve and Huxley eighteen. Although these three may have been able to influence the general tone of the report it seems unlikely that in their short stay in Edinburgh they could have settled the detailed reforms set out in the Commissioners report, let alone had the opportunity to impose their standards on a reluctant set of fellow Commissioners who wished to preserve a Scottish university tradition intact. We should not ignore the fact that in addition to Playfair, Huxley and Froude were nine other Commissioners who contained a majority that were linked with the legal profession based in Edinburgh and that this group must be assumed to have had a basically conservative outlook.

In the discussion of the events in the early part of the century we may acknowledge that Davie's use of the typology of 'southern' and 'northern' may have had a certain heuristic value in that it indicated a geographical division over matters connected with the universities. For the first few decades of the nineteenth-century there was one dominant manifestation of university education in England as long as Oxford and Cambridge retained their monopoly.

However the founding of the University of London was the first step in the break-up of that monopoly and of the disappearance of a consensus on university matters in England. By the middle of the century it was clear that the original aristocratic notion of university education was not the only contender in the field. The fact that Oxford and Cambridge continued to dominate university affairs in the south well into the second half of the century should not be taken as evidence of a uniformity of thought in England. In this thesis we need to examine the differences between the groups interested in university matters rather than assume that there was a consensus where none existed. And so at this point we must turn our attention to a more detailed study of the developments taking place in England.

Oxbridge in the 1870s and the spread of the 'civic universities'

At the two ancient English universities of Oxford and Cambridge further steps to weaken the domination of those institutions by the Anglican church were taken. The University Tests Act of 1871 removed the power of the Church of England to specify that every graduate must swear an oath that he was a member of the established church. In that same year Gladstone, now Prime Minister, wrote to the Vice-Chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge to warn them that the government intended to institute an 'enquiry into the revenues and property of the two universities.' On receiving assurances from both places that there would be no repetition of the policy of non-cooperation of the 1850s the government ordered a Royal Commission to be issued on the 5th of January 1872. This enquiry took its name from its chairman and was called the Cleveland Commission. Unlike previous enquires this Commission was to take evidence in the form of written statements rather than hearing oral evidence. The seven Commissioners were drawn from a narrow section of British society. All seven were English; four were members of the aristocracy and six of the seven had studied at one of the two universities. In contrast to previous Commissions none of these men owed their places to the enquiry to connections with the Church of England. They submitted their report at the end of July in 1874.

By that time Gladstone's liberal administration had been replaced by a ministry headed by Disraeli. No immediate action was taken, but in the Queen's speech on the assembly of parliament in 1876 it was announced that the government would bring in legislation relating to the universities in that session.

Later that year Bills were presented to regulate the finances of the two English universities by forcing the Colleges to make contributions from their large reserves towards a university fund. The liberal opposition objected to the wide powers it was proposed to give the Executive Commissioners who were to carry through the

detailed reforms. As a result of this opposition both Bills were withdrawn in July 1876.

Within the next twelve months the government again indicated that it was going to press ahead with legislation. This time the two Bills were joined into one that covered both universities. The Bill was debated in the House of Commons and amendments were introduced. However no major alterations were forced through and the Bill passed through both Houses and received the Royal Assent on August 1877. In the preamble to the Act it was stated that

> 'provision be made for enabling or requiring the colleges in each University to contribute more largely out of their revenues to the University purposes, especially with a view to further and better instruction in Arts, Science and other branches of learning . . .'[22]

Under this Act seven Commissioners were appointed to carry through the reforms at Oxford and another seven were charged with responsibility for Cambridge. As previously the members of the Commissions consisted of alumni of the university under consideration. Six out of the seven Cambridge Commissioners had at one time held college fellowships and two of the Oxford Commissioners were members of the Hebdomadal council. All the appointees had close links with either Oxford or Cambridge, but unlike previous Commissions only one of the Oxford and two of the Cambridge Commissioners were ordained. In his review of these events Armytage says

> 'much of the formal pattern of university life in both universities was changed. The Laudian statutes were repealed. In reframing them in the vernacular easier methods of amendment were introduced. Life fellowships were further

> limited, and the celibacy rule was abolished, together with a number of clerical restrictions upon election to headships of colleges.'[23]

In Sanderson's study of the universities and British industry he makes the point that the power struggle between colleges and the universities at Oxford and Cambridge which the universities won was closely tied to the struggle over the roles of arts and science in those two institutions. Sanderson comments that

> 'The heart of the matter was the tension of vested interest between the colleges and the university. The colleges were rich and autonomous and the university relatively poor. Yet if science was ever to gain a foothold it would require vast expenditure on laboratories, equipment and staff.'[24]

Elsewhere the same author makes the point that the pre-reform situation

> 'suited the colleges who ran themselves like private companies with the fellows sharing out the profits at the end of the year audit. The colleges were well aware that classics and mathematics were very cheap subjects to teach . . . . curriculum conservation was rooted in the defence of a private financial system and resistance to the growth of centralized power in the university.'[25]

The attractiveness of the relatively cheap traditional curriculum to poorly endowed fledgeling institutions in other parts of the country was, maybe, a factor which inclined those institutions towards adopting a curriculum based on the Oxbridge model.

Owens College founded in Manchester in 1851 by the money left by a local textile manufacturer failed, in its early years, to attract

the support of local industrialists. In his history of what was to become the University of Manchester Charlton records that John Owen's will specified that the trustees were to found an institution to provide instruction

> 'in such branches of learning and science as are now and may be hereafter usually taught in the English universities.'[26]

Sanderson takes this to mean that Owens College adopted 'the traditional curriculum of Oxford and Cambridge.' He supports this contention by noting that the first principal of the college, A.J. Scott

> 'compounded this by giving an introductory address reiterating some themes of Newman's recent addresses on liberal education.'

Sanderson goes on to conclude that 'the Manchester business classes were not interested in a pale imitation of Oxford' and that it was not until the 1870s, when Henry Roscoe provided the institution with 'a new sense of purpose in service to industry', that Owen's College began 'to take its place in the forefront of the civic university movement.'[27]

Charlton, however, offers a different interpretation of events. He indicates that the Manchester men named in Owen's will appointed a sub-committee to advise on the plan for the college; Charlton says

> 'Only one of the five members of the sub-committee had had any university education and, though they eagerly sought and took advice from academic people, the plan they produced was essentially their own plan, a project devised for Manchester by the lay mind of typical Manchester men of commerce and of affairs.'[28]

The sub-committee were influenced by the fact that Owen had specified that the college should provide a 'university education' and they, therefore, took some account of the advice of the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, the Rev William Whewell. In his 1886 study of Owen's College Thompson concludes that

> 'The committee . . . proceeded, at some length, to state their views in favour of a classical course, citing Dr Whewell in support . . .' [24]

The result was that the Trustees appointed three full-time professors who should, in the words of Charlton

> 'deal respectively with the following groups of subjects (1) Languages and Literature of Greece and Rome; (2) Mathematics and Natural Philosophy; (3) Logic and Mental Philosophy, together with general Grammar and English Language and Literature.'

and that three, part-time, chairs were to concentrate on

> '(4) History and Moral and Political Philosophy; (5) Natural History including Botany and Geology and (6) Chemistry.' [30]

On the basis of this information it would appear that Owen's College was originally 'a pale imitation of Oxford' rather than a 'project devised for Manchester'. Although Charlton notes that

> 'The scheme should be made as general as possible . . so that the scheme may possess the capability of adaption to what may be found to be the wants of the community.' [31]

It appears that for the first two decades of the college's history

that aim was not achieved. Armytage supports this interpretation of events when he says that this period of the college's history was a low point; he maintains that Owen's was fighting against a half-hearted sympathy and openly expressed contempt.'[32]

An indication of the nature of the difficulty can be found in the columns of the Manchester Guardian. In an Editorial published soon after the 1858 Annual Report was released it is noted that Owen's College had sufficient funds to compete with the colleges of our most ancient universities and that

> 'the arrangements for giving the young men of Manchester a liberal education are improved year by year . . . In fact we gather from the annual reports of the managers that Owen's College would soon become a perfect an institution as its founder wished, if only there were scholars to avail themselves of its advantages.'

The Editorial justifies its conclusions that the institution is a failure by pointing out that 'the number of students, never very large, continue to decline rapidly. This year . . . there have been only 93 scholars against 154 in the session of 1857.' The paper blames the emphasis on classical education for the failure and concludes that

> 'the college supplies a kind of education which is not wanted . . . and . . . it does not supply the education which is wanted.'[33]

The stimulus to provide an alternative to the traditional curriculum of the ancient universities did not really arise until 1867. There are good reasons to believe that the attitude of the merchants and industrialists in the large cities of England to university education was altered by the evidence of our manufacturers in the Paris International Exhibition of 1867. In an essay on 'universities and the scientific revolution' Eric Ashby argues that

> 'In 1851 British products had carried away most of the prizes. In 1867 British products received a bare dozen awards. No longer was there the reassuraance of easy industrial supremacy . . . . Lyon Playfair had served on the international juries of both the 1851 and 1867 exhibitions. He was an ex-professor of Chemistry, an influential Member of Parliament and a personal friend of the late Prince Consort - able to command a respectful hearing for his opinions. He summarized his anxieties in an open letter to Lord Taunton (who was at that time Chairman of the Schools Enquiry Commission); it was this letter which goaded Parliament to inquire seriously into the need for some State support for technological education.'[34]

Playfair's letter drew attention to the fact that universities in the countries we were competing against were used to provide a valuable training and education for those who would later enter industry; the universities of America and Germany were not the preserve of those aiming for a gentlemanly life of leisure. Playfair pointed out that there was a lack of educational provision in England for the managers of industry.

In his work on 'The Organization of Science in England' Cardwell relates that

> 'The government acted promptly when the storm generated by Playfair's letter broke. They instructed ambassadors and consuls in the various countries . . . . and on the 24th of March 1868 they ordered a Parliamentary Select Committee under Bernhard Samuelson to investigate the whole problem.'[35]

Not surprisingly Lyon Playfair was called upon to give evidence to that Select Committee. When questioned on the reforms he would like to see introduced into the universities of Britain Playfair replied

> 'I do not think the universities of Oxford and Cambridge are at all likely to be developed into industrial science schools, nor do I think it is advisable that they should be. It would be better for those universities to prosecute pure science rather than applied science. We have in this country the University of London, King's College, the institution at Jermyn-street, and Owen's College at Manchester, all of which could very well be developed into science schools, teaching applied science.'

The institution in Jermyn Street was the Government School of Mining, the place where T.H. Huxley taught. In further answer to that same question Playfair drew attention to the fact that

> 'in Scotland we have four universities, all of them readily capable of being developed into scientific industrial schools of the higher class of polytechnics such as we find in other countries.'[36]

Samuelson's Select Committee published its report in July 1868. Among their fifteen conclusions were two which were relevent to the universities. Their seventh conclusion was that 'superior colleges of science . . . cannot be supported by fees alone, without aid from one or more of the following sources, namely, the State, the localities, and endowments or other benefactions' and that, furthermore,

> '(8) That colleges and special schools are most likely to be successful if established in centres of industry . . .'[37]

Clearly Oxford and Cambridge were not seen as the places to establish these 'colleges of science'. The poet and critic Matthew Arnold was also drawn into the debate and offered support to those advocating the continental model. Arnold had been sent on a tour of Europe to study the schools and universities of Britain's neighbours. In 1868 he published the report he had prepared as a result of his

tour. Arnold's report said

> 'We must plant faculties in the eight or ten principal seats of population and let the students follow lectures there from their own homes with whatever arrangements for their living they and their parents choose. It would be everything for the great seats of population to be thus made intellectual centres as well as places of business; for the want of this at present Liverpool and Leeds are the overgrown provincial towns, while Strasbourg and Lyons are European cities.'[38]

The members of the British Association for the Advancement of Science joined the debate on the founding of a 'technical' university. At the 1868 General Meeting of the Association Colonel Alexander Strange spoke with such force that a committee was immediately set up to investigate the provision for physical research in the United Kingdom. For the next two years or so Strange campaigned to persuade the public of the need for education in applied science. In his book on the organization of science in England Cardwell suggests that the Royal Commission appointed in 1872,

> 'the famous Devonshire Commission . . . was instituted in response to Colonel Strange's movement.'[39]

The seventh Duke of Devonshire, William Cavendish, had received a traditional liberal education at Eton College and Trinity College, Cambridge where he graduated as second wrangler. However he had developed a strong interest in science education and, we may speculate, owed his appointment as Chairman to his active support of the furtherance of the study of science in England (including the funding of the Cavendish laboratory at Cambridge.)

Devonshire's fellow Commissioners were a much more varied collection of individuals than had served on previous enquiries. They came from a variety of social and educational backgrounds. Samuelson

had left school at 14 to become an apprentice iron-maker while, on the other hand, sat T.H.Huxley, a major aristocratic landowner in the form of the Marquess of Landsdowne and a Cambridge professor of Mathematics, among others. Most seemed to share only one thing- a liberal bias in politics.

The Devonshire Commission produced eight reports between 1872 and 1875 which covered a number of topics connected with science education. In their third report, on the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the Commissioners stated that

> 'If for the moment we regard the universities simply as educational bodies, and leave out of sight their duties of learning and promoters of original inquiry and research, we can have no hesitation in admitting that their main function in relation to science is to maintain its position as part of liberal education.'[40]

The findings of the Devonshire Commissioners went against 'the climate of opinion', according to Cardwell. Whereas the Commissioners were generally favourable to the cause of science and recommended that the study of science in the universities should be extended and that the State should assist in financing scientific research Cardwell indicates that

> 'the climate of opinion was distinctly chilly for science. The politicians, the civil servants and the public did not rise to the occasion. Generally laissez-faire and self-help continued to be the role of science.'[41]

The doctrine of self-help was certainly one of the strong influences behind the spread of the civic universities that began to emerge in the large provincial cities of England. We may note that one of the more long-term consequences of the 'storm' aroused by Playfair's letter of 1867 was the creation of a spirit, which Armytage refers to as the 'challenge of the times'[42], that lead certain northern cities to

raise funds to assist in the opening of institutions which were to become the 'civic universities.'

We have previously noted that Sanderson contends that it was not until the 1870s that Owen's College, under the stimulus of Henry Roscoe, provided the institution with 'a new sense of purpose in service to industry.' Armytage observes that Roscoe and his colleagues secured the passage of two new Acts of Parliament which enabled 'the civic authorities to participate in the building of a real university for the city.'[43] New laboratories were built, new professors of distinction were imported from abroad and the Medical College, the Extension College united to form an institution worthy of university status. In spite of powerful support from leading educationalists throughout the country Owen's College had to continue for a few more years to be content to submit their students for examination by the University of London.

At Newcastle a positive response to 'the challenge of the times' resulted in the foundation of a 'College of Physical Science'. In 1870 the members of the Mining Institute in Newcastle appointed a committee to consult with the University of Durham about the establishment of a centre for scientific instruction. A conference took place in August 1870 and the university authorities agreed to the proposals; they recognized that efforts to attract students interested in studying science to Durham were unlikely to succeed. According to Whiting's history of Durham University

> 'The university promised an annual grant of £1,250 . . . . if a like sum were granted in Newcastle. Mr Joseph Cowen energetically gave his support in the columns of the Newcastle Chronicle and the sum of £20,000 was raised by public subscription.'[44]

As there were only limited funds available it was agreed that it would be better 'to teach a few scientific subjects well than many subjects inefficiently' says Whiting. In an older history of Durham

University Fowler gives a more detailed account when he says

> 'The friends of literature generously conceded that, at starting, the proposed institution had better profess a few branches of science well, and let literary subjects follow when more firmly established and when means were larger. The naturalists likewise agreed to be content, in the early stages, if geology only - a necessity for the miners - were at first taught. The subjects finally selected as those on which to begin were mathematics, physics, chemistry and geology.'[45]

In October 1871 the College of Science opened its doors. In his collection of extracts on the nineteenth century universities Sanderson quotes from a letter written by the Principal of this College in its first year which recalls that

> 'Of the students who attended the college during the period 1871-1881, and whose present occupations happen to be known to the college staff, 89 are Mining Engineers . . . . 4 are Mechanical Engineers, 3 Civil Engineers, 3 Electrical Engineers, 2 have obtained Whitworth Scholarships, 1 is an Assistant Examiner in the Patent Office, 1 is a Barrister, 5 are Analytical Chemists, 17 are Professors or Teachers, and 17 have obtained Academic distinction in Cambridge or elsewhere.'[46]

From these figures it can be seen that in practice as well as in theory the Newcastle College of Physical Science was offering a curriculum that was quite different from anything offered at Oxbridge, or even at the Scottish universities and that it was catering for the requirements of a different section of society than the older universities in the United Kingdom.

The author of a history of the University of Leeds, A.N. Shimmin, reinforces Armytage's idea of the 'challenge of the times' when he says

> 'The Yorkshire College of Science, as it was first styled, owed its origin to a trade depression and competition from the continent.'[47]

The early steps to found the College did not stimulate a great outpouring of local endowments. Shimmin suggests that it was not until the Clothworkers Company of London 'offered to maintain a department of textile industries' that the collection of subscriptions from the local community really began to gather momentum. From the start the debate on the curriculum of the college centred on the question of literary versus scientific subjects. The Leeds Mercury account of a meeting of the donors of the College in May 1874 reported that Lord F. Cavendish, who presided over the meeting, received some support from the floor (in the form of Hear, Hear) when he said

> 'he must own that he would himself think their institution rather one-sided if they entirely neglected all literary culture.'[48]

In his article on the curriculum of the Yorkshire College Stephens makes the point that 'the particular needs of local commerce and industry'[49] were a factor in determining the curriculum, but that their influence on the early curriculum 'must not be exaggerated' and he insists that the Yorkshire College 'owed its initial curriculum emphasis to outside rather than local support.'[50] Stephen, in particular, is keen to identify the influence of 'certain London City companies.'

The Yorkshire College of Science began to teach students in October 1874 under the direction of three professors. Shimmin says that there were one each in

> 'experimental physics coupled with mathematics . . . geology and mining and . . .chemistry.'[51]

Of the three professors appointed it is worth noting that one

came from Oxford, one from Cambridge and the third from Anderson's College, Glasgow. The formal opening of the College was performed by the Duke of Devonshire on the 6th of October 1875. Speaking at that inauguration Lyon Playfair made the general comment that

> 'I believe that the necessity of adjusting the curriculum to the locality will before long tell on that of the university itself . . . Our universities have not yet learned that the stronghold of literature should be built in the upper classes of society, while the stronghold of science should be in a nations middle class.'[52]

Clearly Playfair recognized that the Yorkshire College of Science needed to cater for the requirements of the local middle classes rather than try to compete with the established universities by trying to aim to satisfy the needs of the upper classes.

Two years after the first students were admitted to the Leeds based institution the curriculum was still subject to argument and debate. In his biography of Sir Nathan Bodington, the Principal of the College in 1883, Draper reports that in 1876

> 'The existing Professors brought the question of including literature and classics in the curriculum before the Education Committee as one of urgency, having had repeated applications, as they said, from students for advice as to the best mode of obtaining instruction in subjects which were requisite for University degrees.'[53]

The Education Committee of the College were told that classics and literature were necessary for the science degrees of the University of London. Although the Committee approved of the suggestion of the Professors they could take no steps to introduce these subjects as insufficient funds were available. It was only when the Cambridge

University Extension Committee came up with an offer to help with expenses that these subjects were added to the curriculum.

The influence of Oxford and Cambridge was felt more directly in the establishment of a College in Bristol. In their account of the early years of Bristol University Cottle and Sherbourne recount that

> 'By June 1873 a scheme for a Technical College of Science in Bristol was ready and a circular was issued explaining the advantages it would bring to the West and to South Wales.'[54]

John Percival, who rose to a position of some importance after his success as the Headmaster of Clifton College, was one of the main characters involved in this initiative. He was concerned that a college such as the one envisaged for Bristol might suffer if it gave too much attention to the needs of the local community. In September 1872 Percival had written a pamphlet in the form of an open letter to the Masters of the Colleges at Oxford in which he maintained that local Colleges

> 'If founded under local influence they are certain to have almost exclusive reference to the practical wants of the neighbourhood, and will consequently attract only special classes of students, and produce little or no effect in the way of liberal culture.'[55]

Benjamin Jowett, the Master of Balliol College, responed to the message in Percival's letter. His views on this topic were most clearly made public four years later when he requested the Commission of the Royal Inquiry on Scientific Education if he might make a statement on the University Extension Movement. Jowett was granted the opportunity to say of the ancient universities that if they

> 'take no part in this movement it passes out of our hands; the local colleges and the instruction given in

> them will assume a different character, and instead of being places of liberal education, embracing classical and general literary studies as well as natural science, they will be exclusively confined to the needs of business, perhaps the mining or engineering wants of the locality.'[56]

So the original committee entrusted with the task of founding a College of Science at Bristol were persuaded by Percival and Jowett to modify their plans. Cottle and Sherbourne report that

> 'When Jowett informed the committee that if the instruction of the college were literary as well as scientific, if the requirements of adult education were specially considered and if the classes were made available to women as far as possible, then Balliol would be ready to subscribe £300 a year for at least five years to its expenses.'
> Immediately the committee changed its plan, and from then on a College of Science and Literature was the aim.'[57]

The University Extension Movement referred to by Jowett was indeed an important way in which the two ancient universities were able to retain some say over the nature of the education being introduced to the 'great towns'. The movement had originated at Cambridge under the influence of James Stuart, a Fellow of Trinity College, who became the Secretary of the University Extension Committee in 1867. By 1873 courses were being conducted in a number of cities. After some experimentation as to the best way of financing these classes a system was devised whereby the 'ladies and persons at leisure' who attended the afternoon classes could subsidize the 'artisans' who came to the evening classes. The popularity and success of this movement was such that within a few years both London and Oxford universities had started their own extension schemes. As we will see this movement was a significant factor in the

later establishment of a network of university colleges.

However it would be a mistake to imagine that Oxbridge provided a complete model for the newer institutions. In his book on 'The Lights of Liberalism' Harvie points out that Stuart

> 'was the son of a linen manufacturer in Fife. He had attended St Andrews, and was there impressed with the democratic intake of the Scottish universities . . . The Scottish experience seemed to indicate that a link could be created between the products of the elementary school and the university which by-passed the social graduation imposed by the secondary school system.'[58]

And yet it cannot be denied that the lecturers moving out of the older universities carried with them a view of university education that was deeply entrenched; a central tenet of that view was the idea of liberal education.

At Sheffield the extension lectures organized by James Stuart prompted the local M.P., A.J. Mundella, to advocate the opening of a college in the city. A local steelmaster, Mark Firth, came forward with the necessary funds to endow a college to house the extension lectures and more. Firth College opened its doors in 1879. In a section on education in Sheffield and Birmingham in his book on class formation in English society between 1830 and 1914 Smith says

> 'The initial stimulus in Sheffield came from the University of Cambridge and the Church of England. During the winter of 1874-5 the learning of the ancient university was brought to Sheffield by way of university extension lectures.'[59]

Smith contrasts this emphasis with that at Birmingham where a local industrialist, Josiah Mason, had set up a trust fund which provided £200,000 to establish a college bearing his name. The trust document specified that

> 'its courses of instruction should develop a sound practical knowledge of scientific subjects 'excluding more literary education.' Although Mason had made his fortune in pen-nibs, his closest advisers were a lawyer and a doctor. In the suceeding decade the combined influence of medical and scientific practitioners within Mason's College was to be paramount. In Sheffield it was to be otherwise . . . . When Firth College was founded . . . . the 'literary education' abhorred by Mason in Birmingham was well established within it.'[60]

In an address delivered at the opening of Mason's College in October 1880 T.H. Huxley drew attention to the provisions of the trust deed and said that if the founder 'refers to the ordinary classical course of our schools and universities by the name of 'mere literary instruction and education' he supports the action. His grounds were that

> 'nether the discipline nor the subject-matter of classical education is of such direct value to the student of physical science as to justify the expenditure of valuable time upon either and . . . that for the purpose of attaining real culture, an exclusively scientific education is at least as effectual as an exclusively literary education.'[61]

The response of Sheffield and Birmingham to the 'challenge of the times' differed. Evidence of a further response to that challenge can be found in the development of Nottingham University College. This institution was a child of the Cambridge Extension Movement, but its 'real significance', according to Armytage, was that

> 'it was sustained by a town rate. This was a new departure; for the other science colleges were more specifically the creation of manufacturers. The Nottingham University College was, if anything, more cultural than scientific;

> its main supporters were the trade unionists of the town.'[62]

The example at Nottingham was followed by the corporation at Liverpool which supported the founding of a University College in 1882 by providing a site for the building of the college and by providing financial support for the new institution in its early years. In 1884 Liverpool followed the example of Owen's College by becoming an affiliate of a federated Victoria University- which had been created by the Privy Council in 1880. Leeds joined the new Victoria University in 1887. In an overview of these events Sanderson indicates that

> 'In order to attract this industrial support, virtually all the colleges made at one time or another very clear statements that their purpose was to serve industry.'

On the very next page of his study this author seeks to reinforce this point when he insists that

> 'almost all the new civic universities and colleges, with the possible exception of Reading, made it abundantly plain that one of their main purposes, if not their sole raison d'être was training and research for industry.'[63]

Yet as we have seen these new foundations did not simply serve the 'needs' of industry. The 'needs' of the professional classes were also taken into account in the development of the curriculum. In his account of Mason's College Smith notes the 'continued influence of medical and scientific practitioners'. In some ways it is difficult to classify the study of medicine as a professional study or as a scientific study; reality undoubtedly lies somewhere between the two. Nevertheless we should observe that medical schools were often united

with science colleges to form the new University Colleges.

In stark contrast to Sanderson's view on the influences on the civic universities is the opinion of David Jones. In a review essay concerned with the Victorian Civic Universities Jones observes that

> 'For new universities professional education was a raison d'être. Liverpool's founders emphasised the needs of medical students, articled Solicitor's clerks, architecture and engineering students and nearly 800 pupil teachers in their earliest appeals for support. In soliciting contributions on this basis the General Committee of the founders recognized that the new college would be providing a service to professional students themselves, to parents seeking respectable places in society for their children, and to the community at large.'

However the contrast between the views of this author and the views of Sanderson may not be as clear as it might at first appear. In his article Jones goes on to make a suggestion that can be seen as a coming together of the opinions and events we have looked at in this section. He states that

> 'The often combined demands of industry and science appeared rather later than is often thought; they largely encouraged the growth rather than the foundation of the earliest civic universities.'[64]

A further complication of the picture of this period occurs if we take into account the fact that the teaching staff recruited to these institutions often came from Oxford or Cambridge. In an article on the British universities and intellectual life Halsey indicates

> 'Just as the aristocratic-gentry culture was never quite routed from the industrial provinces, so Oxbridge had a secure foothold in the modern universities from their inception. Especially in the early stages of their development the staff of the civic universities was heavily recruited by migration from the Oxford and Cambridge colleges. And the migrants came with Oxbridge ideals.'[65]

We cannot conclude that the new civic universities catered exclusively for those advocating the teaching of scientific or technical subjects. The support for the provincial universities came from two sections of the middle classes- the professional classes and the mercantile classes. The balance between these two groups seems to have varied from one town to another. We must also recognize that the studies provided at these institutions were also moulded by reference to notions of what constituted a 'university education'. In this way the influence of the two ancient English universities was important. The old aristocratic idea of liberal education affected the form of the studies at the civic universities and prevented the adoption of a narrow technical education which would have more directly served the interests of those who wanted the universities to provide trained graduates suited for particular jobs. However we should not imagine for one minute that the sons of the upper classes would have found the education provided in the new universities acceptable. While the 'educational' standards may have been satisfactory, the 'social' standards were not. Although Joseph Chamberlain, a member of the upper middle class, was a strong and influential supporter of Mason's College his son, Austin Chamberlain, went to Rugby and then to Cambridge and not to the local university.

Summary to the end of the 1870s

In dealing with the extended time-span covered in the chapter it may prove useful to stop to collect together some of the main points already established before we seek to move on to the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

It is noticable that at a time when much was happening in the industrial towns of England that the Scottish universities were relatively unmoved by the 'challenge of the times'. The report of the Royal Commission on the Scottish universities was published in 1878, but little excitement was generated by the release of the recommendations. Davie describes the main points when he says

> 'Compulsory matriculation was to be initiated; the main business of the Arts Faculty was to be taken up with five alternative specialisms - literary, historical, philosophical, mathematical and scientific; while the old degree, if it was not to be abolished, was to be treated as a sort of sixth specialism for intending divines and such like.'[66]

Just as we have seen that English industrialists and others responded to the 'challenge of the times' so we may interpret the Commissioners report on the Scottish universities as their response to that same challenge. The movement for university reform at this time was isolated in Scotland and England, but was rather a common response to the more global fear that Britain might lose her industrial supremacy. For the first time for many generations those on both sides of the Tweed were forced to consider the threat of competition in their traditional export markets from products made in Germany or the United States. In these circumstances the spokesmen of the mercantile class began to find that their views on the need for more science and technical education in the universities were being sought out. Although the advocates of science and

technology had been consistent in their claims for the extension of the university curriculum since the 1830s it was only when it became obvious that the universities of Germany and the United States were contributing to the industrial progress of those countries that the merchants and industrialists in Britain found that they could have an impact on university matters. Until then the views of the mercantile class had tended to be ignored as that group had been unable to convince the aristocratic and professional classes that the universities should change to concern themselves with such mundane matters as commerce. The association between the aristocracy and the professions had depended on the fact that until then the reform of the universities had been a matter that involved social, not economic, considerations. The professional class ethic depended on the ploy of insisting that social considerations raised them above the grubby commercial world. In the hard economic climate of the 1870s the partnership between the aristocratic ideal of the gentleman and the professional classes acceptance of that ideal as a guiding principle was weakened.

An example of the change in the perception on university matters that occured in the 1870s can be provided by referring to a speech made by Playfair in which he reveals that he is no great supporter of Oxford and Cambridge. He quotes, at length and with approval, from a book by Professor Andrews called 'Studium Generale' which says

> 'No one is ignorant of the influence of the four Universities of Scotland have had in promoting the material prosperity of the country; but few, except those conversant with the practical arts, are aware of the immense advantages England herself has derived from them, particularly in the great northern seats of industry. It may indeed be said without exaggeration, that England would long ago have been forced to establish universities, after the Scottish or German model, for the use of the middle classes, if the universities of Scotland and Germany had not furnished her with a large

> supply of men well versed in the science connected with the useful arts.'[67]

In his address the following year Lyon Playfair was even more blunt about the deficiences of the 'old English universities'. He said

> 'The old English universities have not the same function as the Scotch and Irish universities. The former teach men how to spend a thousand a year, while the latter aim at showing men how to make a thousand a year.'[68]

In England the mercantile class concentrated their energies on providing an alternative to the university education given at Oxford and Cambridge. In Scotland they came into conflict with the professional class as they wished to see the existing institutions changed to deal with the 'challenge of the times.'

Finally in this summary we should note the decline in the influence of ecclesiastical matters on university affairs on both sides of the border. In the south, in particular, we can observe that the composition of the Commissions that reported on Oxford and Cambridge was quite unlike that of the 1850s in that they had only a small number of churchmen. Clearly times had moved on and the old concern about threats to the national interest that arose out of challenges to the church were replaced by arguments which centred on that same national interest, but which referred to matters of economic competition.

Scottish University legislation in the 1880s

The Royal Commission on the Scottish Universities appointed in 1876 presented their report in February 1878. The government of the day, under the Prime Ministership of Disraeli, did not follow up the report with legislation. The report sat on the shelf collecting dust until 1880. According to Anderson the northern universities did not press for action as they 'were enjoying a period of exceptional prosperity' and 'rapid expansion'.[69] When Gladstone's administration replaced Disraeli's, in April 1880 it took up the Commissioners report. In one of his annual addresses to the students of St Andrews Principal Donaldson says

> 'In 1876 a Commission sat to inquire into the working of our universities . . . . no action was taken on it till an agitation in 1881-2 arose, and the subject was discussed in every hand. Lord Rosebery happened to have charge of Scottish affairs at the time, and taking a deep interest in this matter, he read everything that was written in the Universities, made full inquires into the wants of the Scottish people, and drew up the draft of the Bill with his own hand.'[70]

The correspondence between the Lord Advocate, John Blair Balfour, and Lord Rosebery during this period confirms Donaldson's account of the timing of the draft of the future Universities (Scotland) Bill. In a letter from Balfour to Rosebery, dated 24th of December 1881, the author says

> 'I quite concur in thinking that it would be well to advise that an Executive Commission should be issued for the Scottish Universities. There would I fear be a good deal of disappointment if nothing was done in

that direction.'[71]

And yet no immediate steps were taken and the discussed Bill was delayed for some time. Writing in Macmillan's Magazine in 1883 Professor Jack suggested that the implimentation of the practical proposals put forward by the 1876 Commissioners needed only one thing - money. He further posits that as there was no immediate urgency for reform the recommendations were neglected until the financial condition altered in so far as St Andrews was falling rolls and the agricultural depression were having an effect. However Jacks accounts for the delay in introducing the Bill by noting that

> 'the business of the last session was terribly congested and the bill was dropped. Lord Rosebery . . . declined . . . even to lay the measure before Parliament, in the belief that to do so would enable its opponents to organize for its rejection.'[72]

By the spring of 1883 the draft Bill was ready to be introduced into Parliament. Its clauses contained some surprises. For example, it was proposed to abolish the tests for theology chairs, to consider whether or not St Andrews should be wound up and to give extensive powers to the Commissioners in such a way as to avoid to much debate in Parliament on detailed reforms. Rosebery wrote to Sir William Harcourt, the Home Secretary, saying that

> 'The Lord Advocate is strongly impressed with the necessity of introducing the bill before Easter so that the University Councils should be able to discuss it before they disperse. In that case it would be better to introduce it in the House of Lords. But the position arises if a bill so financial in its essence can be introduced into the House of Lords.
>
> In any case it would be most desirable that the

> bill should be brought before the Cabinet at its next sitting . . .'[73]

Harcourt quickly referred the matter to the Prime Minister for consideration who passed it back to Harcourt with the footnote that

> 'Mr Childers is the person to deal with the point raised by Lord Rosebery'.[74]

Again Harcourt acted quickly on Gladstone's comments. On the next day Harcourt had passed the papers on to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, H.C.E. Childers. On reading the provisions of the Bill Childers concluded that

> 'This bill is in my opinion too financial to justify its introduction to the House of Lords.'[75]

It was not until the next month that the Lord Advocate, Balfour, introduced the Bill into the House of Commons. Towards the end of April the Senatus Academicus of Edinburgh University sent a Memorandum on the Bill to Balfour. In reporting this development The Times said that the Senatus Academicus

> 'welcome its introduction although they think several of its provisions highly inexpedient . . . The Senatus depreciate the idea which seems to underline the financial proposals of the Bill, that the time has now arrived when the State on consideration of a fixed annual payment should cut adrift the Scottish universities . . . '[76]

Rosebery's involvement with the Bill arose out of his acceptance of the post of Under-Secretary in the Home Office with responsibility for Scottish affairs. Since his appointment in 1881 Rosebery had been pressing to get the post made one of cabinet rank. As matters stood

he could only press for the Cabinet to discuss the Scottish Universities Bill by working through Gladstone.

In frustration at his inability to deal effectively with Scottish matters to his own satisfaction Rosebery resigned his post in 1883. The Prime Minister did not replace Rosebery, so it fell upon the Lord Advocate to resume responsibility for Scottish affairs and so Balfour was required to support the universities Bill. The clause in the Bill which seemed to arouse most opposition was that which dealt with the financial affairs of the universities. On one side the Scots felt that the intention of commuting the responsibility of government to support the Scottish universities into an annual fixed sum was unacceptable. As Jack pointed out

> 'Unlike the English, the Scottish Universities have always depended to a considerable extent on Parliamentary grants . . . By the Bill this sum is to be fixed for ever at 40,000l. per annum. . '[77]

In June 1883 the Lord Advocate was trying to get some modification of the 'finality clause'. The idea that the government could wash its hands of the universities on the basis of one final lump sum payment was not popular in Scotland. Balfour wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury, Leonard Henry Courtney, reporting that he

> 'had received a number of Scotch members of parliament interested in University matters. They came to say that unless the financial proposals in the Bill are modified, they cannot accept it . . .'[78]

Courtney's reply to Balfour's letter clearly indicates that the Gladstone administration was indeed intent on going against the long established idea that the Scottish universities were to be treated as national institutions. Courtney concluded his letter by saying

> 'I would express my regret that the project of liberating the Scotch Universities from immediate dependence on the State has not been received with complete satisfaction in Scotland. It is under such conditions of freedom that the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin have lived and thriven and the recently formed Royal University of Ireland has been deliberately placed on a similar footing.'[79]

Seven days after Courtney wrote this letter the Universities (Scotland) Bill of 1883 was withdrawn.

The next move in the direction of legislation on the ideas of the Commissioners of 1876 did not occur until 1885. In March of that year Balfour spoke to a 'Bill for better administration and endowment of the Universities of Scotland'. The House of Commons listened to the first reading of the Bill and then entered into a debate which centred on the problem of the source of the endowments.

In May 1885 The Times was expressing doubts as to whether or not the Bill would succeed. The Thunderer said

> 'the bill has given rise to a great deal of controversy and has provoked opposition from various quarters.'

The paper referred specifically to the opposition of those who were against the transfer of the State endowment of the Universities in Scotland from the annual vote of parliament to the Consolidated Fund which involved a fixing of the level of endowment at the figure of £43,000 a year. According to The Times the other main source of opposition to the Bill came from the University Radicals who wished to see the universities democratized by the

> 'transference of the supreme and controlling power in each University from the Senatus Academicus, or

> body of teachers, to the University Court which is an elective and representative body.'[80]

Before this Bill could make any progress through the Houses of Parliament the government were struggling with greater and more pressing problems. The Liberal Ministry was thrown into confusion over the debate on the disestablishment of the Church. Pressure was brought to bear on Gladstone's government by the actions of the Scottish radicals in forming themselves into the National Liberal Federation of Scotland and putting forward a programme of reform which, among other things, demanded church disestablishment. Although the Liberal party saw Scotland as one of their traditional strongholds at each election time the administration could not accept this proposal. Gladstone was a leading advocate of antidisestablishmentarianism and thus was placed in an awkward position. As Ferguson explains

> 'Gladstone had taken Scottish Liberalism very much for granted and was perplexed at these developments. He refused to accept disestablishment, knowing that in the long run this would constitute a threat to the Church of England, to which he was devoted. No compromise seemed possible and deadlock ensued. Both in England and in Scotland Liberal strength was dissipated by numerous double candidatures, and as a result of the general election of 1885 the Conservatives, aided by a pact with the Irish Nationalists, continued office.'[81]

The Marquis of Salisbury headed this Conservative government. Although the new administration discussed the possibility of taking over the Universities Bill from the Liberals in total matters did not go that smoothly. First the measure was deferred and then finally withdrawn in August 1885.

One legislative measure that did survive the change of government was the Secretary for Scotland Act, which received the

Royal Assent on the 14th of August 1885. According to Hanham's account of the 'creation of the Scottish Office, 1881-87' it was not until the amendment Bill of 1887, which corrected the 1885 Act, that the Secretary for Scotland's powers were clearly defined. One of the points in issue at the time was the question of the role that the newly created Secretary for Scotland should play in educational matters. Hanham describes the situation when he notes that

> 'Since 1872 Scottish education had been administered by a Scotch Committee of Council for Education and a Scotch Education Department, both working within the Education Department in London . . . . This arrangement irked Scots patriots who wanted to maintain the individuality of Scottish education and who feared that the Education Department was an anglicising influence.'[82]

The experience of English administration of Scottish education from London since 1872 had lead quite a few leading politicians to suggest that all branches of education should be transferred to the Scottish minister. However, Hanham indicates that

> 'the Scottish educational establishment, headed by Sir Lyon Playfair, supported the existing arrangements and so did the Education Department, whose head was an anglicising Scot, Sir Francis Sandford.'[83]

Sir William Harcourt, the individual entrusted with the 1885 Universities Bill, wrote to Gladstone to clarify the situation; he said

> 'Playfair does not represent the popular sentiment on this subject in Scotland. He represents nothing but University opinion (if even that) and that opinion is purely bureaucratic and centralising . . .'[84]

In the debate in the Commons on the question of the control of

of education in Scotland Sir Lyon Playfair spoke against the clause which transferred responsibility for Scottish education in toto to the Scottish Secretary. As the debate progressed the point raised by Playfair was not put to the vote- we can surmise that he realized that he was in a minority and would not carry an amendment.

So far as we are concerned then the net result of these constitutional reforms were that when the second Salisbury ministry settled into office and began to take steps to legislate on the Scottish universities it was the new Secretary for Scotland, Lord Lothian, who was at the centre of the initiative. In July 1887 Lord Lothian wrote to the Prime Minister to make it clear that he felt that any further delay in the passage of legislation on the universities would 'lead to the most serious results in Scotland.' In this same letter Lothian complained to Salisbury that he was having 'difficulties' with the 'permanent officials of the Treasury'[85] and that he wanted Mr Goschen, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to take steps to overcome these problems. On the 4th of August Lothian's Bill was introduced into parliament, but on the 10th of August it was withdrawn without explanation.

Lothian pursued the matter into the next session. On the 9th of March 1888 he received a deputation representing the University Council Associations of both Edinburgh and Glasgow who pressed him to act on the question of a Universities Bill. On the 10th of March Lothian was again in correspondence with the Prime Minister with a draft of the Universities Scotland Bill 'in the hope that you may be able to sanction its introduction.' Lothian went on to say that 'it is essential that the bill should be introduced at once.'

Lothian's draft of the new Bill did not go into the question of finance. Lothian's letter to Salisbury closed with the footnote

'The question of money is left open.'[86]

Presumably the hope was that this question could be dealt with by the

Executive Commissioners and would not, therefore, arise as a bone of contention which could delay the passage of the Bill through Parliament.

Lord Lothian was keen for Lord Rosebery, the Leader of the Liberals, to be named as chairman of the Commission. In a letter to Salisbury from his principal private Secretary, S.K. McDonnell, Lothian is reported as thinking that

> 'Lord Rosebery must be appointed, that indeed their is no alternative and that it will render the administration of the Bill more easy and more popular if he is Chairman . . .'[87]

By the 23rd of May Lothian was aware that Lord Salisbury had vetoed his idea; in correspondence to his Under Secretary at the Scottish Office, Cochran Patrick, Lothian says he is 'in as much of a quandary as I was before'.[88] Two days later a letter from the Principal of St Andrew's University, James Donaldson, to Lord Rosebery contains the report that

> 'I saw Cochran-Patrick today. He told me that your name was submitted to the Cabinet by Lord Lothian in a letter and that the reply contained an "absolute veto" to your being appointed Chairman. Mr Patrick says that when the reply came to Lord Lothian Lord Lothian was in a terrible state. He never saw him so angry or vexed . . .'[89]

Although angry with the decision Lord Lothian had to accept the position and proceeded to persuade Lord Kinnear, a respected Judge of the Court of Session, to accept the post of Chairman.

While these events were taking place behind the scenes, the Bill was progressing through Parliament. On the 19th of March 1888 the Universities (Scotland) Bill was ordered in the Lords.

The Bill was welcomed by the press on both sides of the border. The Times called it 'the best Universities Bill that has ever been produced'[90] and The Scotsman maintained that it was 'the most complete and advanced measure of its kind that yet been seen.' However, The Scotsman was not blind to one shortcoming. In its Editorial of the 23rd of March it was pointed out that

> 'it has only one really weak point. That point is the vagueness as to the grant of funds.'[91]

After the second reading of the Bill in the House of Lords The Times commented

> 'if it does not pass this session, it will not be for want of compliments, good wishes and general approval. Every speaker praised Lord Lothian's measure; and the debate faithfully reflected the feeling out of doors.'[92]

On the 25th of June the House of Lords passed the Bill, with amendments and it proceeded to the Commons. The Bill received its first reading in the Lower house as a matter of course. The second reading was set for the 20th of July. Without explanation the Bill was deferred. Whatever reasons there may have been for the delay they were not made public. The two most likely causes of difficulty were that the question of finances was the stumbling-block or that the problem was the composition of the Executive Commission. In any event the Bill was withdrawn in December 1888.

Speaking to the students of St Andrews University in October 1888 Donaldson suggested that the 'real obstacle' to the passage of a Scottish Universities Bill was

> 'that during all these six years the British Government had not been able or willing to allow a few days for the discussion of the Bill. The Scotch members rightly refuse to pass the Bill without discussion, but for a

> Scotch question of such great importance Government can afford no time.' [93]

However, early in 1889 the Bill was reintroduced and this time the Government did allow time for Parliament to debate its provisions. In the last days of June and the first days of July the House of Commons sat as a committee to consider the new Scottish Universities Bill.

As Lord Lothian had anticipated one of the more contentious issues in the debate was the topic of the size and composition of the proposed Executive Commission. The Governments list of proposed Commissioners was criticized by the Liberal opposition for being too long and for reflecting too narrow a political and educational strata.

It soon became clear that the Government were going to have to compromise on the question of the composition of the Commission. The opposition threatened to force a debate and division on each and every name on the list if necessary. In these circumstances the Government agreed to delete the last four names on their original list so as to allow the opposition Front Bench to put forward their own nominations. As a result of these developments Lord Lothian's correspondence reveals that he wrote to Professor Robertson Smith, to Sir William Thomson (the famous inventor and holder of the Chair of Natural Philosophy at Glasgow), to Professor Butcher (the head of Greek at the University of Edinburgh since 1882) and to Mr Frederick Fuller (the retiring Professor of Mathematics at Aberdeen University). All these gentlemen replied to Lothian's invitations and accepted the idea that they should join the proposed Commission.

Davie suggests that from the Scottish point of view these changes in the composition of the Commission were 'disastrous'. He says

> 'trouble suddenly started when the professorial nominees

> of the Government turned out to be Englishmen of high academic distinction indeed but wholeheartedly associated with the policy of promoting in Scotland the cause of classical Oxford and mathematical Cambridge, and insufficiently appreciative of the traditional values of the native system.'[94]

Butcher can be identified as the representative of Oxford and Fuller of Cambridge. Whether or not these two gentlemen were 'insufficently appreciative' of the Scottish system must remain an open question. However we can note that both Butcher and Fuller had extensive experience of teaching in the Scottish universities; they were not ignorant of the native system.

After passing through both Houses the Bill finally received the Royal Assent at the end of the 1889 Parliamentary session. The preamble of the Act stated that it was 'for the better administration and endowment of the Universities of Scotland.'[95] The first part of the Act concerned itself with the reform of the constitutions of the University Courts; the Courts were made responsible for the running of the property and revenues of the Universities while the Senates of the universities were left with the job of dealing with discipline and academic matters. The second section named the Commissioners and, in sixteen clauses, specified their powers. In this section the Commissioners were entrusted with the task of extending the university system in Scotland by affiliating new institutions to the existing institutions. A clause was included on the question of finance which specified that

> 'There shall be charged upon the Consolidated Fund . . . the sum of forty-two thousand pounds, to be applied for the purpose of the said universities .
> The said annual sum granted in pursuance of this Act shall be deemed to be in full discharge of all past and present claims of the said universities.'[96]

An amendment was made to the Bill during its passage through Parliament that required the Commissioners to take evidence and make a special report to Her Majesty on the question of religious tests. As with the previous Executive Commission of 1858 the details of the educational changes were left unspecified so as to allow the Commissioners to act freely.

Early in October of 1889 the first meeting took place in Edinburgh under the chairmanship of Lord Kinnear. In contrast to the previous Commissions the aristocratic representation was down to only two. The Marquis of Bute and the Earl of Elgin had both studied at Oxford rather than at one of the Scottish universities. But, as always, the legal profession was well represented. The Dean of the Faculty of Advocates, William Mackintosh, headed the list of lawyers. Alexander Craig Seller, a lawyer and M.P. for the Partick division, was appointed to the Commission, but he died in 1890. He was replaced by Alexander Crum, the brother-in-law of Lord Kelvin who had sat on the previous Commission when he was still known as Sir William Thomson. Sir Charles Dalrymple was also a lawyer and M.P. When Salisbury's first ministry were considering the chances of pursuing the 1885 University Bill Dalrymple had been the individual made responsible for the passage of the Bill. Donald Crawford was a member of the Edinburgh-based legal profession, but unlike the foregoing Crawford had had a more cosmopolitan educational background. After studying at Edinburgh Academy and Glasgow University Crawford went to Balliol College, Oxford and then on to the University of Heidelberg in Germany. At around the same time as he became a member of the Scottish bar Crawford was elected to a fellowship at Lincoln College, Oxford. In 1885 he had been elected Liberal M.P. for a Scottish constituency.

Sir Henry Roscoe had also studied at Heidelberg before working to promote the teaching of science at Owen's College, Manchester and elsewhere. Two other Commissioners with experience of the continental universities were Sir Arthur Mitchell, the first lecturer in archeology at Edinburgh University, and W.G. Blackie, a graduate of

of Glasgow before gaining a Ph. D. at Jena University in Germany.

James Alexander Campbell was the sole representative of the mercantile interest, but he owed his place on the Commission to the fact that he was the M.P. for Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities. He had previously served on the 1876 Commission.

As with all the nineteenth century Commissions on the Scottish Universities the main bulk of Commissioners were Scots. Of the fifteen persons appointed in 1889 eleven were definitely of Scottish origin with another, Kelvin, born in Belfast and raised in Scotland. Butcher was born in Dublin and educated in England. Fuller appears to have been more English than Scottish while Roscoe was definately English.

Davie's comments on the composition of this Commission contains the remark that

> 'the fate of the Scottish universities was left in the hands of a Commission which contained hardly anyone with much feeling for the Northern system except the two relatively obscure 'extra-mural' educationalists who, according to A.J. Balfour, were financially interested in crammer establishments.'[97]

The two 'extra-mural' educationalists were W.G. Blackie and Sir Patrick Heron Watson. Balfour's comments, which Davie refers to without giving any specific reference for, were made at the time of the Commons debate on the 1889 Bill. Balfour stated

> 'Nobody has made any great secret of the fact that Mr Blackie and Dr Watson are committed to extra-mural teaching. One is the head of an extra-mural college, and the other, I believe, is engaged in extra-mural teaching.'[98]

Rather than condemning these two for their extra-mural links, as Davie seems to imply Balfour was engaged in, Balfour was pointing out that they were included on the list of Commissioners because of their knowledge of extra-mural education.

The strength of the 1889 Commission, especially when compared to prior Commissions, was that it was not dominated by the products of either the Scottish or the English university systems. Unlike those previous Commissions this one contained a core of individuals who, as a consequence of their experience of the continental universities, were able to bring to these deliberations a depth of understanding that went beyond the bounds of a simplistic English versus Scottish universities debate that we observed was a part of earlier enquires.

In this way for Davie to describe the contributions of these Commissioners to the discussion of the reform of the Scottish universities predominently in terms of the old Scottish or English ideas is to take too narrow a view of the suggested reforms. We have already seen how in the 1870s there had been a movement to relate the question of university reform to the notion of industrial performance. By the end of the next decade the pressure on the universities to play a part in the the industrial struggle and to contribute to national development had steadily increased.

The nature of the relationship between the universities and industry forms a central focus of Sanderson's book on 'The Universities and British Industry, 1850-1970'. In that study the author includes a chapter on the Scottish universities in the later half of the last century in which he readily acknowledges that

> 'The Commissioners of 1889 . . . are regarded in some circles to this day as the final wreckers of the old Scottish higher education system in the name of Anglicization. They attacked its open democratic character by abolishing unrestricted entry and starting the matriculation examinations. In doing that

> they changed the peculiar nature of the Scottish school-university linkage by forcing up the school-leaving age by two years. They suppressed the general with honours degree, leaving the general degree for schoolmasters and clergy, but creating parallel courses in which it was possible to begin specialization from the start in imitation of English-style honours.'[99]

While Davie clearly sees these moves in terms of the 'anglicizing' of the Scottish universities there is an alternative view that also seems to fit with the details presented here. Sanderson points out that the reforms urged by Huxley and Playfair and men like them were open to two interpretations. Either the reforms were an attempt to bring Scottish higher education into line with the practices in England or they were doing what was necessary if Scotland was to ever produce her own scientists. Sanderson argues that

> 'it was not the old Scottish system that had produced Kelvin or Tait or Clerk Maxwell or Fleeming Jenkin and this was the greatest indicament against it. For the eighteenth century land of ministers and schoolmasters the old general degree was sufficient, but not for the later nineteenth century.'[100]

In England the 'civic' universities can be seen as the main outcome of the pressure to contribute to industrial progress via higher education; Oxford and Cambridge made some concessions to this movement, but without losing sight of the fact that their clients, the undergraduates, were not expected to enter the world of commerce or industry.

In Scotland the single attempt to found a civic university occured at Dundee where a series of uncertain steps were taken by a local family to establish a college that would cater for the cities needs. As we will see the status of this institution was unclear even in the first decade of the twentieth century- the nature of the problem

concerned its relationship with the neighbouring University of St Andrews. Sanderson indicates in his analysis of the Scottish universities that Scottish businessmen were less ready to support these local universities than were their counterparts in England. He says

> 'If there was one salient feature that distinguished Scottish higher education in this period it was the lack of a civic university movement. From this viewpoint Scotland was almost unfortunate in being so well endowed with universities in 1850, for it meant that her problems was adjustment of an old system in which there was too little variation between institutions.'[101]

Maybe it was because the Scottish universities were subjected to these 'adjustments' while in England new institutions were opened that it may appear to Scottish commentators that the northern universities were subject to an unfair amount of interference when compared to Oxford and Cambridge. Sanderson concludes that the outcome of the differences between the two countries was that

> 'whereas England began the period under consideration with two universities almost totally disengaged from industry, she was able to set up in stark contrast her civic colleges that all together provided a wide range of specialisms and linkages. Scotland began with hers more traditionally involved with industry and in 1850 it would be fair to say that the Scottish universities at that time were better than the English. But by 1900 this was no longer the case for the English system had developed into one of vastly greater variety than its Scottish counterpart . . .'[102]

From the study of the events that we have been looking at in this chapter we can agree with Sanderson's idea that while the Scots wished to develop existing institutions the English set out to

provide new institutions which were to cater for the new demands being made on higher educational institutions.

In his chapter on the end of century reforms Davie indicates

> 'social and administrative developments were making things more difficult than ever for those who wished to preserve the distinct identity of the Northern system.'[103]

Unfortunately Davie only considers the problems of adjusting the Scottish universities to the changing times in abstract terms; he does refer to the demand for trained scientists and technologists, but only in passing. Unlike the analysis provided by Sanderson, in which it is indicated that in the second half of the century the Scottish universities were in decline, Davie maintains that the years between 1876 and 1889 were later remembered as a 'silver age in the history of the Scottish universities.' This vague assertion is not supported by the evidence; in fact on the very next page of 'The Democratic Intellect' Davie recounts that

> 'During the thirty years which had elapsed since the 1858 Act, the difficulties and discontents of the Universities- not to mention the material poverty- had become more intense than ever, as they had doubled their numbers in that time- from about 3,500 in 1861 to about 7,000 in 1888. A reorganization had thus become imperative.'[104]

It had indeed. The need for reform was real, not a consequence of the whims of the 'anglicizers.'

In his study Sanderson makes the point that the Commissioners made changes which affected the relationship of the schools to the universities. Now since the secondary schools in Scotland came under the control of the London-based Education Department founded in 1872 the whole educational system had grown rapidly. This expansion had

clear implications for the university system. The universities had a long-standing tradition of accepting students over a much wider age range than the universities in other parts of the world. Historically this had been seen as one of the systems great strengths as it filled the gaps that were all too evident in the secondary school system. The practice had continued well into the nineteenth century and one of the 1876 Commissioners merited an entry in the Guiness Book of Records on this account. The entry reads

> 'The most extreme case of undergraduate juvenility was that of William Thomson. . . who entered Glasgow University aged 10 years 4 months.'[105]

By the second half of the nineteenth century the continuation of this practice had created certain problems for university teachers who were faced with the difficult task of trying to teach large classes which contained students of a wide age range. Mitchison rightly observes that

> 'the problem could not be resolved by insisting that what had served fourteen-year olds well in the 1770s was the only suitable curriculum for eighteen-year olds in the 1870s.'[106]

So in addition to the review of the curriculum the Commissioners of 1889 were required to inquire into the desirability of introducing an entrance examination so as to regulate admissions.

The lack of success of the graduates of the Scottish universities in the Indian Civil Service examinations was an indication of things to come. Since the beginning of the century the size of the job market for the graduates of the four northern universities had grown out of all recognition. Rather than just producing graduates for the three learned professions so that they could take up positions in Scotland the situation had changed so that towards the end of the century the graduates coming out of the Scottish universities were entering a job

market that extended into England and beyond into the furthest corners of the Empire. In this job market the competition was intense and, as a result, the emphasis on examinations grew as a means for sorting out the successful candidates from the unsuccessful. In his discussion of the work of the 1889 Commission Grierson comments on this trend when he observes that

> 'The work of the Commission of 1889-93 was to smash this uniform, if narrow, curriculum and to introduce the blessed principles of options. The impulse to this change came from two sources. It came from America . . . The other impetus came from the great liberal doctrine of the nineteenth century, the doctrine of laissez-faire . . .' [107]

This pursuit of the policy of laissez-faire had been the main stumbling block against which all attempts to get the State to grant aid to the universities and university colleges had foundered. It appears that the economic depression of the 1880s may been the turning point in the governments attitude. Armytage points out that in 1885

> 'a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate the nature of the economic depression through which Britain was passing. Among the numerous opinions offered by witnesses before this Commission, there was a strong measure of agreement that foreign competitors, especially German and American, enjoyed greater educational facilities through the active help of their respective governments.' [108]

As we have seen from the General Report of the Scottish Universities Commission those universities were in receipt of an annual grant of £42,000. This practical acknowledgement of the value of the Scottish universities by the government was welcomed north of the border even though it was less than had been hoped for. Mackie informs us that

> 'As early as 1892 the sum voted to the Scottish universities was increased to £72,000 by the Education and Local Taxation Account(Scotland) Act.'[109]

The extra £30,000 per annum allocated to the universities under this Act arose out of rather unusual circumstances. In an internal confidential momorandum written in 1934 and filed with the papers of the University Grants Committee G. Macdonald reported to J. Beresford that when

> 'school fees were abolished in England at the cost of the Exchequer, and Scotland thereupon became entitled to an Exchequer grant of equivalent amount.'

it was decided that the money should be allocated as follows

> '(1) £60,000 for Secondary Education
> (2) £30,000 for the Universities
> (3) £25,000 for Pauper
> (4) £50,000 to Parish Councils
> (5) the volume to Local Authorites in relief of rates.'[110]

To get back to the specific reforms brought about by the 1889 Commissioners we should observe that students had a wider choice of what they could study and a choice of the level at which they wished to study. Anderson sums up the situation with regard to the options available when he notes that

> 'every student had to take at least one subject from each of the traditional fields of classics, philosophy and science, and two subjects from at least one of these fields.'[111]

This was for the ordinary degree. Davie describes this as being retained for

> 'those students destined for local and provincial work as ministers or school teachers or minor officials.'[112]

Alongside this system was instituted a separate Honours degree which was organized in such a way that the Honours students shared five courses with their ordinary degree companions; Honours work was completed in addition to the standard curriculum. In Anderson's view

> 'although Honours students studied five subjects instead of seven, and aimed at an Honours degree from the start, this was hardly a scheme for early specialization.'[113]

This interpretation is in contrast to the view expressed by Davie who contrasts the studies of ordinary degree students with those of

> 'their fellows aspiring to swell the growing ranks of the organisers and specialists required for the new Imperial Britain were relieved of the burden of doing compulsory philosophy and, instead, were given a narrower type of training which left them intellectually indistinguishable, or almost so, from the Southern product.'[114]

Although Davie himself sees the 1889 and 1892 reforms as the final defeat of the Scottish tradition he does indicate that

> 'in practice the 1892 reforms have proved very acceptable to Scots of all parties over a period of seventy years.'[115]

Anderson criticises Davie's book for having little hard information about what was actually taught or what the various Commissions proposed. He agrees with Davie in that he sees the 1892 reforms as a compromise which saw the ordinary degree as pointing to Scottish careers while the Honours degree pointed to British careers. But Anderson disagrees with Davie's description of the ordinary degree; he sees it

as being made more flexible, not more rigid. He reminds us that the great majority continued to take this degree and that philosophy continued to be a compulsory part of the Honours course until the reforms of 1908-10 - a fact that Davie does not mention.

Problems of finance in the English universities

In England the universities of Oxford and Cambridge took a different attitude to that of the Scottish universities over the question of finance. Since their medieval foundations the colleges in these two university towns had managed to build up vast fortunes through the careful administration of their generous endowments. The extent of their wealth was such that in the 1870s the government had forced the colleges to divert part of their wealth into university funds to avert the need for the State to step in with aid to finance the reforms discussed in the previous section. The college heads agreed to this step because they feared that the alternative was a potentially greater evil. They believed that the provision of State aid for the two universities would be the thin end of a wedge which would have lead to state interference in the everyday running of Oxford and Cambridge.

The resolve of the heads of the colleges and the university governing bodies to resist State aid was put to the test over the next decade or so as they found that their outgoings increased at the same time as their income decreased. The provision of facilities for the teaching of science put a strain on the resources of both Oxford and Cambridge at a time when the incomes of the colleges from their agricultural investments were declining.

The investment policies of the colleges made them vunerable to flucuations in the price of agricultural commodities. The colleges owned large blocks of the English countryside which they rented out to tenant farmers. In the 1870s the development of the North American railway system from the eastern seaports into the centre of the continent enabled the grain producers of the Prairie states to sell their cerial crops on the international grain market at a rate that English producers found difficult to match. As a result of this

alteration in the balance of the market the price of cerials dropped and the tenants of the farms belonging to the Oxbridge colleges found they could not make sufficient profits from their harvests to pay the rents asked by their landlords. In these circumstances the colleges had to face the reality of a decline in their incomes, but they resisted the temptation to ask for State aid.

However it was the master of Balliol College Oxford who joined with other leading educationalists in a campaign to persuade the Conservative government to start providing State aid for the University Colleges. Benjamin Jowett joined with Huxley, Sir Berhard Samuelson and the liberal M.P.s Henry Roscoe and A.J. Mundella in appeals to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to step in with funds to help the University Colleges that were struggling to exist on local contributions and fees.

In March 1887 Jowett had a letter published in The Times which prompted The Thunderer to print a Leading Article in support of the claims of the provincial colleges. The call for funds was echoed by Henry Roscoe, now the M.P. for South Manchester where he maintained his links with Owen's College. The Times published Roscoe's letter in which he said

> 'It is satisfactory to know that the whole subject of the furtherance of scientific and technical education in the country is at the present moment under serious consideration of Members of Parliament of all political parties . . .'[116]

The government were put in the position of having to speak on this subject by a parliamentary question placed by the M.P. for Sheffield, A.J. Mundella. The Chancellor, Mr Goschen, pointed out that no quick answer could be given as the question was 'full of difficulty, looking at the immense expenditure which might be involved'[117] if the State accepted full responsibility for supporting

the University Colleges. The campaigners were not satisfied by this response. Four days after Goschen's statement the Chancellor received a 'large and influential deputation', according to The Times report. This deputation pressed upon him the claims of Victoria University. It was reported that Mr Goschen listened sympathetically, but made no promises.[118]

The Victoria University was made up by the union of Owen's College at Manchester with University College, Liverpool and the Yorkshire College at Leeds. The union was seen as a successful experiment, but further financial resources were needed if it was to develop further.

In spite of these pressures on the government it was not until 1889 that the Conservative government of Lord Salisbury first indicated its willingness to help. In that year the Civil Service Estimates included a figure to aid the University Colleges. As Armytage records

> 'the sum of £15,000 was put down for distribution to university colleges. A memorandum stated that since all these foundations (with the exception of Oxford, Cambridge and Manchester) were in financial straits, the Treasury recognized their need. A committee was appointed to advise on the disbursement of the grant. Its members were Sir John Lubbock, Sir Henry Roscoe, J. Percival, G.F.Browne, R.C.C. Mowbray and Henry Oakley.'[119]

In fact Oakley was appointed as the Secretary to the Committee as a result of his position in the Education Department. Sir John Lubbock, the Chairman of the group, was a leading banker with an interest in educational matters. Since 1880 he had sat in the Commons as the M.P. for the University of London. Roscoe's links with Owen's College we have already mentioned. The Rev J Percival was involved in the establishment of the Bristol University College prior to taking up his position as Headmaster of Rugby School. The Rev G.F. Browne was

a Cambridge man with an interest in university administration. He was a central figure in the development of the Cambridge Local Examinations syndicate and a member of the 1877 Royal Commission on the finances of Cambridge University. Mowbray was the Chancellor's inside man; he was a lawyer who sat as a Conservative member for Prestwick. In 1887 he was appointed Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

This well-balanced Committee were required to investigate the claims of institutions that were providing 'teaching of a university standard in arts and science and are located in populous districts.' In all twelve colleges had applied for aid, but in the report to the Chancellor the Committee wrote that they

> 'fear that the Hartley Institute at Southampton must be excluded from the list, as there is not a professional staff adequate for the complete teaching of university subjects; moreover there does not appear to be a proper representative governing body.'

The Committee commented on the fact that, apart from Owen's College

> 'several of the colleges do not seem to have met with so much local aid as might have been expected, or as the work they are doing for the higher education of the commercial andindustrial classes undoubtedly deserves.'[120]

In allocating the £15,000 between the twelve institutions the Committee members tried to balance considerations of efficiency with those of poverty. In their attempts to 'harmonize' these considerations they came up with the following recommendations

'Owen's College, Manchester	1,800
University College, London	1,700

Liverpool University College	1,500
Mason's College, Birmingham	1,400
Yorkshire College, Leeds	1,400
Nottingham University College	1,400
Bristol University College	1,200
Durham College of Science (Newcastle)	1,200
Firth College, Sheffield	1,200
Dundee University College	500'[121]

The Treasury accepted the recommendations of the Committee and the grants were duly distributed. The fears of the heads of the Oxford and Cambridge colleges about the repercussions of accepting State aid turned out to have some foundation. In the Treasury Minute on these grants it was stated

> 'it would seem reasonable to require that each college, as long as it continue to receive State assistance, should furnish annually to the Education Department a Statement showing the result of the last academic years work.'[122]

In March 1892 a further Committee was appointed to investigate whether or not the £15,000 grant had

> 'been efficacious in stimulating local effort in the places where these colleges are situated and whether the country is receiving an adequate return for the amount contributed out of general taxation.'[123]

Henry Oakley was again the Secretary to the Committee and Roscoe and Mowbray were again Committeemen; they were joined by G. Curzon, James Bryce, who had been a lecturer at Owen's College in the 1860s before sitting for the liberal interest as an M.P. for Aberdeen South, and a career civil servant, William Courthorpe.

These individuals met and recommended that there should be a 'substantial annual addition to the grants from 1892-93' to cater for

> 'the increased efforts made by the Colleges since 1889, the fact that all educational work connected with science is increasing yearly in cost, the pressure of urgent needs, the growth in the number of students, the enlargement of the teaching staff!'[124]

all of which have 'contributed to strain the resourses of each college very considerably.' However the Treasury rejected these pleas and the grant continued at its existing level.

In May 1894 a further Committee, consisting of Bryce, Roscoe, Playfair and Kennick, reported to the Chancellor. Lyon Playfair's place on the committee was, probably, due to his being the M.P. for South Leeds and William Kennicks as a result of his position as M.P. Birmingham North. These men considered the cases of five new claimants and included Bedford College in London on their list of institutions worthy of support. Both of these extra Committees recommended that a more efficient form of inspection of the University Colleges be instituted to replace the system of statistical returns and reports from the colleges themselves that was the existing system.

The fact that the University College at Dundee was on the list of approved institutions can be seen as an indication that the policy of treating university education in Scotland as completely separate to that in England was breaking down. The establishment of the Dundee institution in 1881 had followed English precedents in so far as it was the result of a local benefaction.

The Treasury Minute of 1889 commented on the relationship of Scottish to English university education in the following way

> 'The number of claimants in England is out of all proportion to that in Scotland, but then it must be remembered that the Universities proper in the latter country are more numerous than those of the former, are situated in great centres of population and therefore cheaper and more accessible, and already receive substantial assistance from the State.'[125]

The 1892 Committee noted that the Scottish University Commissioners 'have not felt themselves able to make any grant to Dundee' even though it was linked with the university at St Andrews. They

> 'resolved to admit Dundee on the same terms as the other colleges receiving grants.'[126]

Although the 1894 Committeemen saw the position of Dundee differently the Treasury continued to provide a grant for this Scottish University College.

In the matter of the relationship of the State with the universities it appears that the developments of the 1880s and 1890s reflected a coming together of the English and Scottish systems. In certain respects these university institutions on both sides of the border were being treated by the government on an equal footing. However this does not mean that English ideas had overtaken the Scottish system. If anything a contrary pattern can be discerned; the new ideas about the financial relationship of the universities and the State approximated more closely to a southward movement of Scottish notions rather than a northward penetration of English ideas.

Summary

In this summary of the events in the last quarter of the nineteenth century it is important to compare the Scottish experience with the English experience in terms that will assist us in reaching some useful conclusions in the final chapter. It is clear that as the century unfolded the debates on university matters in Scotland and England became more and more alike. While Davie may take this as evidence that the Scottish system of university education was being absorbed into the English system the evidence we have considered seems to point to an alternative interpretation.

Firstly, during the course of the century communications between various parts of Britain were substantially improved. As a result those in Edinburgh could keep abreast of developments in London in much the same way as those in the south could keep up to date about changes taking place in Scotland. As the demands on the universities in Scotland and England were similar it seems likely that the solutions to the problems achieved in one part of the country should be known about and adopted elsewhere.

Secondly, we may observe that people in Britain became more conscious of the important role their universities could play in improving the industrial performance of these islands. The examples of Germany and America were there for all to see. The fact that the English and Scottish universities were both subjected to this pressure and yet came up with differing solutions to the new demands must be seen as evidence of the enduring cultural differences between the two countries.

In this chapter we have seen that the universities of Scotland were asked to extend their curriculum to include scientific and technical studies on a much wider scale than previously. The financial implications of this were quite serious as it cost more

to provide facilities to teach science than it did to teach the arts. The laboratory and the consumables required to teach the physical sciences were a much more expensive requirement than the provision of a lecture room to teach the arts.

In Scotland the same institutions were encouraged to teach both pure and applied science whereas in England we have seen that a division arose between Oxbridge and the civic universities which saw the former specialize in pure science while the latter concentrated on the applied sciences. In this way the liberal educational idea linked with the aristocratic view was perpetuated in so far the studies pursued intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards. The creation of a two-tier university system in England meant that a head-to-head clash between the local form of liberal education and scientific education was avoided. However in Scotland the matter of university reform was more traumatic than in England as the existing universities were expected to adjust to new demands on the nature of scientific education whilst preserving a university tradition that was close to the hearts of all true Scots.

Chapter Six

Conclusion

In this thesis I have suggested that the conflict between the aristocracy, the professions and the mercantile wing of the middle class was resolved by local compromises which reflected local differences in the relative strength of those groups. In this way the hypothesis outlined in the opening chapter, that an understanding of the reform of the Scottish and English universities in the nineteenth century can be based on the study of the interaction of those three contending interest groups, seems fully justified.

In this conclusion I wish to review the findings of the previous chapters by discussing the persistent themes that have arisen out of the consideration of the differences between the aristocracy, the professions and the mercantile wing of the middle class. So rather than reproducing the summaries of the conflicts between those groups I will concentrate on the survey of the ideas advocated on university reform. From the study of the junctures referred to in the substantive sections of this thesis we can identify three matters that have emerged as 'issues'. Firstly, that concerning the education of a 'gentleman'. Secondly, that which viewed the universities as training grounds for the professions and, thirdly, that which aimed to link university education with national economic performance.

So let us start at the beginning. In the chapter on the pre-Victorian era universities we noted the common origin of the English and Scottish universities as part of the bureaucratic structure of the Holy Roman Empire. We saw how the Reformation broke up that unity. As the Church of Scotland retained its links with the church in Europe rather than with the Church of England contrasting administrative structures were adopted in the two countries. In Scotland the local presbytery were expected to play a role in church affairs

while in England the administration of church affairs was vested in the hands of the Bishops. This difference can be seen to have been of fundamental significance in the development of a distinct 'social ethic' in Scotland (to use Davie's apt phrase). Nairn says

> 'The Scottish Reformation had been a wholly different affair from the English one and had given rise to a distinct social and popular ethos rooted in distinct institutions.'[1]

A consequence of the impact of Calvinism, the main influence on the Reformation in Scotland, was that distinct institutions, namely religious, legal and educational institutions, came to share features with continental institutions rather than with those of England.

Even the political union of the two Kingdoms under one parliament failed to alter this state of affairs. So far as we are concerned the most significant outcome of the Union was that the Scottish aristocracy, or at least the most important and politically active members of that class, moved from Edinburgh to London after 1707. This exodus had two consequences that are worth mentioning. Firstly, the vacuum left by the movement of that powerful group was filled by the professional wing of the Edinburgh middle class and, in particular, by the legal section of that class. And secondly, the movement of the aristocracy led to an association in the minds of many Scots of aristocratic ideas with England.

So in the eighteenth century the universities in Scotland and England came to cater for different groups. In Scotland the Lowland seminaries at Edinburgh and Glasgow developed a form of 'liberal education' based on the study of philosophy that was used as a basis of the arts course. The intention of these studies was to provide a general education that could at one and the same time fill a gap left by the deficiencies of the Scottish secondary school system, while at the same time providing a basis on which students going on to professional studies could ground their work in theology, law

and medicine.

These developments arose out of the need for the Scottish universities to enter the market place to maintain the incomes of the professors. The system of payment in the north was related to the number of students enrolled and attending the lectures provided by the professors. The professors were, thus, well motivated to respond to new developments in their subject area. In particular they could earn a good living by developing courses which catered for those students who were working towards the entry qualifications of one of the learned professions. As the eighteenth century progressed the universities in Scotland gained an international reputation for their expertise in professional studies. The medical faculties, in particular, attracted students from many corners of the English-speaking world.

Meanwhile in England the two ancient collegiate unions in the market towns of Oxford and Cambridge continued to concentrate on an English form of 'liberal education' that took account of social considerations. The emphasis on classical studies, in the form of the study of Latin and Greek or mathematics, was a result of an approach which saw the universities role in terms of the inculcation of 'gentlemanly' attributes.

The previously mentioned association of aristocratic values with England in the north was reinforced by these developments and by the linkage of the English universities with the aristocracy and the clergy of the Church of England. As Ferguson notes

> 'By the end the eighteenth century . . . more and more upper class Scots boys attended the English public schools and many of them went on to one or other of the English universities. The result was to create a chasm in Scottish society which persists to this day and which divides an anglicised upper-class from other sections of the nation.' [2]

By the beginning of the nineteenth century the contrasts between the Scottish and English university systems were well established. In Scotland the Enlightenment had precipitated the development of many new courses and reinforced the Lowlanders' interest in, and involvement with, education in the universities. The expansion of Edinburgh and Glasgow was a steady feature of the second half of the eighteenth century. The universities at St Andrews and Aberdeen did not expand at anything like the same rate and, in fact, maybe even suffered as a result of a migration of students from those areas to the cities in the lowlands. Some of the students who went to Edinburgh and Glasgow collected class attendence certificates that would help them get jobs in a variety fields while others completed the full arts course and the courses in professional studies specifically to gain entry to one of the three learned professions.

In England the numbers attending the universities were proportionately much lower than in Scotland. The actual numbers varied greatly throughout the century as a consequence of the changes in the definition of the education deemed suitable for a 'gentleman.' At times a university education was judged to be a useful attribute for a gentleman, but at times the universities were seen as quiet backwaters out of touch with the social graces. In general terms it can be said that those who did attend the eighteenth century English universities did so as a stepping stone to preferment in the Church of England or as a place to practice some of the social graces.

In this way the question of the education suitable for a 'gentleman' was a significant feature so far as the English universities were concerned, but was of little importance in Scotland. In the north the aristocratic idea of a gentleman was seen as something originating in England and, therefore, not important to those who wished to see the Scottish universities retain their 'Scottishness.'

The English universities, in turn, were not interested in the training of those entering the professions. At this point the Dons and

professors at Oxford and Cambridge associated themselves with the aristocratic 'gentlemanly' ideal.

Only a small number of individuals in Scotland and England at the beginning of the nineteenth century seemed concerned about the connections between the universities and industrial progress. However, we can observe that Glasgow did extend its curriculum to include engineering studies. At this time Glasgow was the premier commercial and industrial city in Scotland and an increasingly important point in the infrastructure of the British Empire. The port was involved with trade with many parts of the world and the technological requirements of the industrial community would have been more apparent here than anywhere else in Britain.

The study of the situation at Glasgow illustrates a point that is of general importance in this thesis. We have contended in this work that the universities can be studied in relation to the ideas of three contending interest groups. Now, the case of Glasgow is a clear example of the difficulty of delineating the nature of the linkage between the universities and the ideas of various groups. The question remains was the 'demand' for engineering the first example of the mercantile classes success in advocating the cause of technical studies in the universities or was the 'demand' for engineering studies in Glasgow merely a reflection of the needs of local people. Analytically this difference can be described in terms of the problem of did the chicken come before the egg or did the egg come first. In practical terms the difference between the two situations comes down to one of the nature of the organization of the 'demand'. It is in the light of this problem that we can appreciate the value of looking beyond the specific time or place in order to perceive trends.

In the third chapter we observed that parallels could be drawn between the events surrounding the Royal Commission on the Scottish universities and the subsequent attempts to implement the ideas in that Report and the lead up to the founding of University College

and King's College in London. While some might wish to concentrate on the question of the secularization of the universities the perspective used in this thesis draws our attention to the changes in the relationship between the aristocracy and the professional and mercantile wings of the middle classes. In some ways this difference of interpretation reflects a difference in the perceptions of those involved in the events were are studying. Stated in very general terms we can see that the aristocracy were intent on defending the status quo by claiming that the attempts to reform the universities were indirect attacks upon the church. Meanwhile both wings of the middle classes would have argued that the changing relations in nineteenth century society should be reflected in changes in the universities. Viewed in this way the founding of the Gower Street and Strand institutions can be interpreted, not as two outcomes of religious differences, but as two responses by the professional and mercantile classes to provide an alternative to the aristocracies monopoly of university education in England. In so far as our consideration of this period tells us that both points of view and interpretations were influential we can conclude that the end result was the product of a compromise between the various viewpoints.

The structure and curriculum of the University of London provides us with evidence that in the first half of the nineteenth century the Scottish universities were held in high esteem by certain sections of English society, namely the professional classes. Reader states that

> 'The great speciality of London University as a whole, as of the Scottish universities, and in rivalry with them, was medical education.'[3]

The greatest form of flattery is imitation. The professional classes in the south saw the model of Edinburgh and Glasgow as worth emulating. The movement of educational ideas from the north to the south in this way is significant because it is a clear indication that educational transfer need not follow the lines established by the

transfer of political or economic influence.

There is further evidence of the transfer of educational ideas from the north to the south in the origins of the civic universities in the 1870s and 1880s. These pieces of evidence could be used to draw general conclusions about the relationship between political and economic matters and educational affairs. However whilst the links referred to in this thesis are suggestive it is not conclusive evidence. Further work and analysis is required to develop these points, but that task is beyond the scope of this study.

From our discussions of the early part of the nineteenth century we can observe that the notion of a 'gentleman' still had a controlling grip on the minds of those involved in university reform in England. Those advocating the use of the universities as a site for professional studies were forced to acknowledge the strength of the aristocratic idea and divert their energies to providing an alternative to Oxford and Cambridge so that these existing institutions went unchanged. The aristocracy and the clergy consented to, and even approved of, certain reforms that were justified on the basis of the extension of the gentlemanly ideal. The most notable examples of this trend involved the professional classes. Some professionals were in favour of an association with aristocratic ideals so that they could form a mutually benefical protective barrier against the spread of the mercantile spirit. The linkage of these two groups and ideas helped both the aristocracy and the professions to put down the men of business. The professional wing of the middle class benefitted from this alliance in that they were able to distance themselves from the other section of the middle class by associating the professions with the aristocratic idea of a gentleman

This interpretation of events is in accord with the views expressed by Anderson. In his work on Scotland and her education system in the last century Anderson approaches the same point from the opposite end of the continuum when he says

> 'the values of classical and liberal culture seduced the professional part of the middle class at an early stage, and that the more utilitarian values of the commercial bourgoisie never succeeded in challenging their dominance.'[4]

The three M.P.s elected to the Commons after the Reform Act of 1832 to represent constituencies connected with Scottish universities tried to challenge the dominance of classical and liberal culture and its alliance with professional studies, but their challenge failed to gain support and was overtaken by the initiatives of the professional wing of the middle class.

The mid-century reforms considered in the fourth chapter provide some evidence that the relationships between the three contending interest groups was subject to changes. The Reform Act of 1832 did not bring about any immediate changes, but it was part of a process that was growing in strength. The first half of the nineteenth century had been a period of urban growth and rural decline. The old aristocratic power base in rural society was not as secure as it had previously been. With this gradual decline went a decline in the old system of patronage. Slowly, but surely, a new 'achievement-based' system of selection was introduced which served to legitimate the unequal distribution of jobs and power. In his study of 'the origins of modern English society' Perkin makes the point that

> 'The personal, face-to-face relationships of patronage, unlike the impersonal solidarities of class, could only exist in a society distributed in small units, a society of villages and small towns in which everyone knew everyone else.'[5]

The old aristocratic idea of the 'amateur' that we saw enshrined in the East India Company reforms had been dealt a severe blow with the debacle of the Charge of the Light Brigade. The notion of an

'officer and a gentleman' was qualified in so far as the education process came to be seen to be connected with the production of the 'right sort.' The status of an individual was not longer a simple matter of birth. Although the reform of the selection procedure of the East India Company was a move away from the old aristocratic system of patronage we must note that the innovations that were introduced were on the terms delineated by the aristocracy.

The ascendancy of the aristocracy in England was challenged by the rise in the estate of the professional classes. The growth in the numbers and prosperity of professional men between 1850 and 1870 has been commented earlier. This expansion served to stir Oxford and Cambridge from their slumbers. These two institutions found that they could no longer resist the claims of the supporters of the ideas associated with the professional classes. Whereas the previous attacks on these two English universities had come from outside this latest attack came from within. Although the colleges were still financially independent they were being taken over by men who were building professional careers for themselves in academia; the professors and lecturers were part of the professional class. In his book 'From Clergyman to Don' Engel studies how Oxford took its first steps towards developing an academic profession and how the ideas of the professional classes came to be used to expand the numbers of those who could call themselves 'gentlemen.' Engel maintains that

> 'High social position was a crucial element in Victorian people's conception of professional work.'

Engel refers to Trollope's definition of a profession as

> 'a calling by which a gentleman, not born to the inheritance of a gentleman's allowance of good things might ingeniously obtain the same by some exercise of his abilities.'

Engel's observation that the idea of a 'gentleman' embodied an important status distinction is reinforced when he says that

> 'It embodies the ideal of ruling-class egalitarianism; all men certainly were not socially equal, but all gentlemen were. Fundamentally, a profession was an occupation which a gentleman could follow without losing his claim to this coveted social position.'[6]

As the century progressed the emphasis in the debate over the universities changed. By studying certain junctures in the history of these debates we can see that the question of religion decreased in importance as the years went by and that the question of using the universities to reinforce and legitimise existing social divisions increased. In this way the matter of the Indian Civil Service had little to do with the question of religion, even if certain defenders of Oxford and Cambridge raised the cry of 'the church in danger.'

In Scotland the position was somewhat different, but parallels can still be noted. The influence of the professional ideal in the northern universities was stronger than in England. The writings of Lorimer for the Association for the Improvement and Extension of the Scottish Universities provide explicit evidence of that influence. The universities north of the border suffered a set back when the examination procedures for the East India Company were instituted. However while some commentators have interpreted the relative failure of the graduates of Scottish universities in those exams as evidence of the inferior educational standards in those institutions, an alternative interpretation seems to fit the evidence more closely. The alternative view is that the relative failure was nothing more and nothing less than an indication of the success of the policy that the English notion of a 'liberal education' should form the basis of the examinations. In their efforts to ensure that 'gentlemen' should succeed in the new selection process, and that the aspiring members of the mercantile classes should be excluded,

the reformers put the graduates of the Scottish universities at a decided disadvantage. In this mid-century period the impact of the ideas of the mercantile classes on university education and related matters was mainly a negative one in so far as those higher up the social ladder seemed intent on excluding members of the mercantile wing of the middle class from positions of prestige.

It was not until the last quarter of the nineteenth century that the link between the universities and economic performance as emphasised by the mercantile classes came to have a positive role to play in the decision-making process. Whether one sees the Reform Act of 1867 as part of the rise of the mercantile class or as the basis of their rise is of secondary importance in this context. The primary point is that the mercantile section of the middle class were actively involved in the foundation of the civic universities in the industrial centres of England, and in the institution set up in Dundee. Furthermore the older universities of both Scotland and England were forced to take account of the new tenor in the public debate that arose after the poor performance of British industrial products at the Paris International Exhibition of 1867.

The 'challenge of the times', as Armytage calls it, was met in different ways in Scotland and England. In the north the universities continued their tradition of responding to outside requirements and instituted reforms in the existing universities. In the south the reaction to the challenge was to found new institutions. The fact that the Scots reformed their universities rather than creating new institutions meant that the process of change was more traumatic than in the south. Even the case of Dundee was an example to the difficulties of combining the old with the new; St Andrews relationship with Dundee was full of upsets. However in the last decades of the last century and in the opening decades of this century the universities of Scotland and England came to face a common consequence of the demand for the extension of the study of science and technology. On both sides of the

Tweed the most pressing problem came down to the question of money. The cost of providing the extra facilities required to teach science and technical studies at university level were such that all institutions of higher education felt the need for increased funds. The First World War compounded this problem and eventually the government were forced to agree to the establishment of the University Grants Committee to administer · the distribution of extra support. Over two hundred years after the political union of Scotland and England the universities in these two countries came under the administrative control of one State department. And yet the differences between the two university systems still persisted.

As we have seen one of the essential differences between the aristocratic, professional and mercantile ideas on university matters centred on the question of the reform of the curriculum. A number of compromise solutions between the groups were found. The spread of science into the education of the upper echelons of Scottish and English society was achieved on the terms owing something to each of the groups mentioned. This process involved the 'professionalisation' of science and the rising of the status of some forms of 'pure' science so as to make it acceptable to 'gentlemanly' ideas of what is suitable for someone with social ambitions. The compromise reached in both Scotland and England were to have a long term effect on our society. Wiener refers to this process as the 'gentrification of the industrialist' and draws attention to the fact that

> 'on the continent an engineer was frequently addressed as "Engineer" much as a medical man is addressed as "Doctor". Nowhere in continental Europe, remarked a Management Consultant, "does one find the extraordinary British split of 'pure' and 'applied' science, one clean, the other dirty."[7]

The distinction between pure and applied science was stronger in England than in Scotland; in this respect the Management Consultants

reference to a "British split" is misleading. In Scotland the status of the engineer was higher than in England. The fact that an engineer received a university education and came to be regarded as a member of the professional class resulted in snowball effect which lead to the Scottish universities producing a steady stream of engineers who made an invaluable contribution to to the prosperity of Victorian Britain by filling a gap in the English educational system.

The gap between pure and applied science arose out of a prejudice that was deeply entrenched within the old universities. Rothblatt provides evidence that this prejudice existed well into the twentieth century. He indicates that

> 'So deeply rooted was the disdain for commerce and industry, for the values which they were supposed to represent, that numerous dons and non-resident M.A.s decided the worth of an academic subject by its usefulness to commerce and industry. In their view almost no subject which could be turned to the benefit of business deserved university recognition.'[8]

Applied science was rejected by Cambridge and Oxford, but pure science gradually found its way onto the curriculum of the ancient English universities by virtue of its links with mathematics and its intrinsic value in terms of its 'mind-training' properties. As Cambridge had an existing emphasis on mathematics pure science was more acceptable there than at Oxford. In this way the idea of providing a general education suitable for a gentleman could be preserved and the danger of producing narrow specialists avoided. This matter was the subject of much debate in the 1860s.

At this point we may find it useful to lift our gaze from the events in Britain to see if we can learn something from a brief comparison of the role of the aristocracy in Germany.

In Germany the aristocracy had a different relationship with the middle classes than their counterparts in England. On this point Wiener suggests that

> 'because the industrial revolution in Germany took place later and more suddenly than it did in Britain, the German industrial bourgeoisie had less time to become accepted by and absorbed into the older elite. Second, the Prussian aristocracy, in particular, was less ready than the English aristocracy to accept wealthy businessmen into its ranks, regardless of how much they hastened to remake themselves on the Junker model.'[9]

Although Wiener seems to confuse 'British'with 'English' the point stands that the English aristocratic ideals became part of bourgeois culture as the sons of wealthy industrialists abandoned their parents' culture to become part of gentry culture. If an industrialist or commercially successful Victorian was willing to buy a country estate and send his sons to the right public schools and universities he could ensure that his offspring were upwardly mobile, even if he was not. The rapid expansion of the public school system in England in the second half of the century was a clear indication that large numbers of the middle classes were willing to see their sons subscribe to the 'gentlemanly' ideal. Wiener maintains that

> 'If Oxbridge insulated the sons of the older elites against contact with industry, it also gradually drew sons of industrial and commercial families away from the occupations of their fathers.'[10]

In Germany the universities were reformed in the early decades of the nineteenth century before the country had felt the full impact of the industrial revolution. The German aristocracy had not

the same close relationship with the old universities as was found in England. In their section on Germany Ben-David and Zloczower indicate that in the first years of the century

> 'Most of the aristocracy had no traditions of education, and the minority who had such interests, preferred French to German education.'[11]

In these circumstances we should not be surprised to observe a lack of aristocratic influence on the German universities. Whereas the English universities were national institutions under the influence of aristocratic society those in Germany were bourgeois institutions controlled by the local states. In his 'Portrait of the Victorian Age' G.M. Young asserts that the universities served as barriers against all-encroaching materialism and professionalism. Hence that

> 'the universities broke the fall of the aristocracy by civilizing the plutocracy.'[12]

While this stylish phrase adequately describes the relationship between the aristocracy and the mercantile wing of the middle class it ignores the important role played by the professional class. In general terms, as well as in terms of university reform, this latter class acted as a buffer between the other two viewpoints. From this conclusion, and the material on Germany, we can further conclude that the relationship between the English aristocracy and the professional classes served to extend the life of the gentlemanly ideal into the twentieth century.

We started this chapter by saying that local compromises reflected the local differences in the relative strength of the aristocratic, professional classes and the mercantile wing of the middle class. Clearly the enduring differences between Oxbridge, the civic universities and the universities of Scotland are an indication

that no one set of ideas were able to dominate the question of university reform throughout Scotland and England.

In his seminal work on 'The Long Revolution' Raymond Williams offers an overview of the matters considered here when he says

> 'Somewhere in the nineteenth century (though there are earlier signs) the English middle class lost its nerve, socially, and thoroughly compromised with the class it had virtually defeated.'[13]

Williams' analysis of the educational context is based upon the distinctions he draws between four sets of educational philosophies or ideologies. He describes those philosophies under the headings of (1) liberal/conservative, (2) bourgeois, (3) democratic, and (4) populist/proletarian and suggests that curriculum changes have reflected the relative power of these different groups over the last one hundred years. In this regard the analysis in this thesis is very similar to Williams' ideas. The main difference concerns the delineation of the groups. Williams' includes the merchants and professional men under the same heading of 'bourgeois', while he separates the radical reformers from the working class. In so far as this work has been developed to study universities we should anticipate some differences. In his study of 'curricula as socially organized knowledge' Young criticizes Williams' general approach in that

> 'little attention is given to the changing power relations between the groups which might account for curricula changes.'[14]

This sounds simpler than it really is. For example, Williams' indication that the middle classes gave best to the aristocracy on the <u>social</u> front can be confirmed from the evidence considered in this thesis, but that is only part of the story. On the <u>economic</u> front the most influential group turned out to be the mercantile class and it was

on the basis of economic arguments that the universities were reformed to take account of the ideas put forward by the spokesmen of the mercantile class. Furthermore, the analysis here indicates that cultural differences were an important factor in understanding the contrasts between the power of the professional class in Scotland and England. These three areas of concern all have to be set against changes taking place on the political front as events in that sphere can also effect the relative positions of the groups identified here. The approach adopted in this thesis allows us to separate out changes in one sphere from events in another. This facility is an original, but not unique, feature of the methodology used here.

The main advantage of this approach is that we can move from one frame of reference to another without losing the thread. Other, more limited, approaches may have allowed us to consider the impact of industrialization, for example, but only in a limited way. It would have been difficult to relate industrialization to the process of secularization or to changes on the social or cultural dimensions. The methodolgy used in this study has allowed us to perceive that although, for example, the aristocracies political and economic ascendancy was questioned it was sometime before their social position was called into question.

At this point we can turn to consider the evaluation of the work produced by G.E. Davie in his book on 'The Democratic Intellect.' From the foregoing observations we can indicate that Davie operated with a perspective that lay great emphasis on the national differences between Scotland and England. When he talks about the 'anglicization' of the Scottish universities he is addressing the reader to the consideration of cultural differences and not economic, political or social. His perceptions on the Scottish eduction tradition relies upon the delineation of a distinct Scottish 'social ethic.' This is a persuasive and, to a limited extent, convincing aspect of his study. And yet we must see it as a partial interpretation. It is partial in that it distorts the historical picture. Obviously every

study can be described as incomplete, but this is not what is meant.

During his consideration of the 'three attacks' on the Scottish university tradition and our parallel study of those junctures we have seen that the criticisms raised in the opening chapter by a number of reviewers are substantially correct. His interpretation of those attacks is limited in so far it it fails to take account of the events beyond the Scottish border. Davie assumes that influences coming from the south originate in England whereas we have seen that in the second half of the century Scotland and England were both subject to influences that were connected with developments in Germany and the U.S.A. Davie imposes a monolithic quality on southern values that fails to distinguish between the ideas coming from abroad, those arising at Oxford and Cambridge and those originating in the industrial cities of northern England. This deficiency in Davie's work is, maybe, a result of his rather casual approach to the historical record. One even suspects that Davie's use of references serves to support his interpretation of events rather than allowing those events to speak for themselves.

A further criticism should be levelled at those who have used his work as an authority on matters which are beyond the scope of his study. In particular we must recognise that Davie's entry into this area of work was through a desire to establish the role of philosophy on the curriculum of the universities of Scotland. Others have used 'The Democratic Intellect' to draw conclusions about the control and form of university education in Scotland. While those matters are implicit in the work the study is of more limited application. These difficulties centre around the fact that Davie fails to draw his evidence together in the form of a conclusion and that he does not reflect on other interpretations of events.

Other workers in this field confirm that alternative views can be reached from the data Davie collects. For example, Robertson says

> 'It can be argued, however, that these reforms represented an intelligent compromise between the demands of a society which increasingly required technical sophistication and values of the native educational tradition.'[15]

The evidence considered in this thesis indicates that Davie is correct in his interpretation that the universities were under attack, but that his introspective approach leads him to misinterpret the origin of the attacks. The attacks came from the south, but they amounted to more than a process of 'anglicization'. Some advocates of reform had experience of the universities in England, but that does not mean they were involved in a straightforward transfer of English practices. The failure in confidence in the supporters of the traditional system was part of the failure of the middle classes to resist the social ascendancy of the aristocracy in all parts of Scotland and England.

By the end of the nineteenth century the Scottish and English universities did come together in some respects. That was just as much a result of the southward transfer of ideas as of the northward passage of ideas. The differences in the two eighteenth century university traditions had been modified by changes in the role of the church, by changes in the relationship of the church with the State and also by the complex alterations in the relationships between the aristocratic, professional and mercantile classes.

By considering the Scottish case in the light of developments in England this thesis has indicated that the changes in the universities in both countries was part of a wider process of change that reflected a number of factors. The enduring social prestige of the aristocratic idea of a gentleman, the increasing usage of the educational system to select entrants to various occupational positions in the professions and the association of economic performance with education have been established as factors in the reform of the universities.

The success of this work in providing an original analysis of the changes in the nineteenth century leads one to consider that the methodology and perspective developed in this thesis may have applications in other studies. The same contending interest groups were involved in a number of other reform movements that were concurrent with the events covered here. On the face of it the approach adopted here could be used to study the expansion of the public school system, the establishment of university systems in India and Australia, for example, or even with the study of such matters as the reform of local government in Victorian Britain.

While the overall methodology may have application in other spheres we should express some reservations about applying the typology used in this thesis elsewhere. The identification of the groups in this work arose out of the study of secondary sources. In these circumstances it seems unlikely that they would have a wider usage. Hence we have already observed that Williams' uses a typology that includes the working class and which takes account of developments in the twentieth century that go beyond the scope of this work.

The Victorian age was a reforming age. The stamp of Victorian ideas remains with us in many twentieth century institutions, not least the universities. But we should reflect that the Victorians set out to solve problems that were current in their times and, therefore, we should not be unduly influenced by the solutions they achieved. In this thesis we have seen that the modern university was the product of a continuous process of change. We cannot halt that process.

References

—

Chapter One. Introduction

1. Grant (1981) p. 144
2. Shapin and Thackray (1974) p.3
3. Stone (1971) p.46
4. Davie (1981) p.4
5. Collins (1977) p.26
5a. Collins (1979) p.59
6. King (1980) p.13
7. Gerth and Mills (1948) p.242
8. Ben-David and Zloczower (1962) p.64
9. Hexler (1961) p.147
10. Garland (1980) p.11
11. Cannon (1984) p.47
12. Rothblatt (1976) p.86
13. Rothblatt (1976) p.131
14. Rothblatt (1976) p.97
15. Thompson (1963) p.28
16. Kitson Clark (1965) p.214
17. Kitson Clark (1965) p.216
18. Kitson Clark (1965) p.230
19. Kitson Clark (1965) p.255
20. Saunders (1950) p.309
21. Phillipson (1974) p.423
22. Phillipson (1981) p.28
23. Anderson (1983) p.27
24. Cant (1967) p.1959
25. Withrington (1970) p.178
26. Sanderson (1972) p.120
27. Green (1969) p.241
28. Collins (1979) p.94
29. Ringer (1979) p.19

30. Vaughan and Archer (1971) p.8
31. Davie (1981) Forward
32. Davie (1981) p.XI
33. Davie (1981) p.XII
34. Davie (1981) p.XIV
35. Davie (1981) p.XIX
36. Davie (1981) p.3
37. Davie (1981) p.4
38. Davie (1981) p.5
39. Davie (1981) p.6
40. Davie (1981) p.24
41. Davie (1981) p.XIV
42. Horn (1962) p.82
43. Storr (1963) p.189
44. Withrington (1961) p.96
45. Briggs (1963) p.569
46. Simon (1961) p.169
47. Young (1971) p.42, f-n.8
48. Hanham (1975) p.345
49. Withrington (1961) p.98

Chapter Two. The Origins of University Education in Scotland and England and their contrasting development up to 1820

1. Rashdall (1936) Vol.III p.23
2. Rashdall (1936) Vol.III p.276
3. Green (1969) p.14
4. Nicholson (1974) p.241
5. Coulton (1935) p.20
6. Lyte (1886) p.47
7. Lyte (1886) p.308
8. Nicholson (1974) p.191
9. Rashdall (1936) Vol.II p.303
10. Cant (1970) p.4

11. Robertson (1976) p.450
12. Rashdall (1936) Vol.II p.319
13. Green (1969) p.191
14. Kearney (1970) p.11
15. Kearney (1970) p.15
16. Kearney (1970) p.55
17. Armytage (1955) p.55
18. MacNalty (1947) p.
19. Kearney (1970) p.23
20. Kearney (1970) p.21
21. Trevelyan (1984) p.197
22. Rait (1895) p.104
23. Kearney (1970) p.54
24. Dickerson (1961) p.354
25. Ferguson (1978) p.103
26. Cant (1970b) p.228
27. Cant (1970b) p.226
28. Cant (1970b) p.226
29. Grant (1884) Vol.I p.126
30. Horn (1967) p.73
31. Kearney (1970) p.58
32. Kearney (1970) p.173
33. Kearney (1970) p.154
34. Hill (1972) p.108
35. Hill (1972) p.130
36. Green (1969) p.45
37. Kearney (1970) p.149
38. Kearney (1970) p.146
39. Kearney (1970) p.24
40. Barrington Moore (1966) p.15
41. Rendall (1974) p.37
42. Chitnis (1976) p.131
43. Camic (1983) p.180
44. Harvie (1977) p.64

45. Smout (1980) p.612
46. Harvie (1977) p.29
47. Withrington (1970) p.169
48. Hutchinson (1975) p.583
49. Graham (1969) p.81
50. Harvie (1977) p.68
51. Smout (1978) p.3
52. Cant (1967) p.1956
53. Emerson (1977) p.456
54. Emerson (1977) p.457
55. Withrington (1970) p.184
56. Curtis (1948) p.134
57. Sutherland (1973) p.14
58. Green (1969) p.47
59. Green (1969) p.51
60. Quoted in Withrington (1970) p.197 f-n.44
61. Smout (1978) p.2
62. Webb (1978) p.48
63. Harvie (1977) p.72
64. Rendall (1974) p.1
65. Smout (1969) p.501
66. Chitnis (1976) p.124
67. Smout (1969) p.506
68. Trevor-Roper (1967) p.1636
69. Halsey (1962) p.91 f-n
70. Mathew (1966) p.78
71. Mathew (1966) p.79
72. Smout (1969) p.364
73. Smout (1969) p.381
74. Smout (1969) p.476
75. Ferguson (1978) p.170
76. Furniss (1976) p.452
77. Porter (1986) p.178
78. Ashby (1966) p.6
79. Rothblatt (1976) p.75

80. Rothblatt (1976) p.86
81. Rothblatt (1976) p.95
82. Rothblatt (1976) p.96
83. Stone (1974) p.47
84. Cannon (1984) p.47
85. Jenkins and Jones (1950) p.99

Chapter Three. The 1826 Royal Commission on the Scottish Universities, the attempts at legislation in the 1830s and the founding of the University of London

1. Wright (1979) p.94
2. Green (1969) p.53
3. Mackie (1954) p.255
4. Morrell (1972) p.40
5. Davie (1981) p.26
6. Anderson (1902) p.350
7. Anderson (1902) p.353
8. Peel Papers, B.M. Add.40,339, f.258
   letter dated 5th December 1825. Copy
9. The Times 15th March 1825, page 2, column 4
10. Home Office Papers, P.R.O. H.O. 102/36.422
    letter dated 20/28th (?) December 1825
11. Blue Book (1831) XII, p.215
12. Peel Papers, B.M. Add.40,386, f.182
    letter dated 18th April 1826
13. Aberdeen Papers, B.M. Add.43,202, f.50
    letter dated 30th November 1826
14. Grant (1884) Vol.II, p.38
15. Omond (1883) Vol.II, p.288
16. Blue Book (1831) XII, p.
17. Mackie (1954) p.255
18. The Times, 2nd September 1826, page 2, column 6
19. Davie (1961) p.26

20. Davie (1981) p.26
21. Davie (1981) p.340
22. Furniss (1976) p.460
23. Furniss (1976) p.461
24. Home Office Papers, P.R.O. H.O. 102/37.270
    letter dated 25th September 1826
25. Blue Book (1831) XII, p.134
26. Blue Book (1831) XII, p.135
27. Blue Book (1831) XII, p.200
28. Davie (1981) p.33
29. Blue Book (1831) XII, p.201
30. Davie (1981) p.30
31. Davie (1981) p.31
32. Anderson (1983) p.46
33. The Scotsman, Vol.XVI. No.1254, 14th January 1832
34. Blue Book (1831) XII, p.200
35. Kitson Clark (1965) p.7
36. Horn (1959) p.173
37. Morrell (1968-69) p.255
38. The Times, 8th May 1833, page 1, column 4
39. Morrell (1968-69) p.256
40. The Times, 29th July 1835, page 3, column 3
41. Morrell (1968-69) p.257
42. The Times, 21st July 1835, page 3, column 5
43. The Scotsman, Vol.XIX, No.1622, 25th July 1835
44. Rait (1895) p.348
45. Home Office Papers. P.R.O. H.O. 102/42, f.223
    letter dated 28th October 1835
46. Morrell (1968-69) p.259
47. The Aberdeen University Magazine, Vol.I, No.XII, 21st June 1836
    p.201
48. The Times 2nd April 1836, page 4, column 2
49. Ferguson (1978) p.308
50. Aberdeen Papers, B.M. Add.43,202, f.148
    letter dated 17th June 1836

51. The Scotsman, Vol.XX, No.1727, 27th July 1836
52. Hansard, Third Series, Vol.34, column 990, Lords, 28th June 1836
53. N.L.S. Mss. 2904, f.93 letter dated ? end of July 1836
54. Davie (1981) p.35
55. Hansard, Third Series, Vol.34, column 993, Lords, 28th June 1836
56. Ferguson (1978) p.302
57. Davie (1981) p.35
58. Davie (1981) p.36
59. The Scotsman, Vol.XX, No.1727, 27th July 1836
60. Withrington (1983) p.74, f-n.42
61. Hansard, Third Series, Vol.35, column 757, Lords, 1st August 1836
62. N.L.S. Mss. 2904, f.93 letter dated ? end of July 1836
63. Coutts (1909) p.423
64. Shapin (1975) p.239
65. Shapin (1975) p.224
66. Green (1969) p.100
67. Bellot (1929) p.56
68. Bellot (1929) p.235
69. Bellot (1929) p.233
70. Hearnshaw (1929) p.40
71. Hearnshaw (1929) p.93
72. Armytage (1955) p.173
73. Hansard, Third Series, Vol.XXV, column 636, Commons 28th July 1834
74. Bellot (1929) p.241
75. Bellot (1929) p.248
76. Vaughan and Archer (1971) p.54
77. Gash (1961) p.581
78. Green (1969) p.107
79. Reader (1966) p.136
80. Anderson (1983) p.48
81. Huxley (1881) p.3
82. Houghton (1957) p.116

Chapter Four. The Mid-Century Reform of Oxford and Cambridge, Open Competition in the Indian Civil Service and the Universities (Scotland) Act of 1858 in context

1. Ferguson (1978) p.307
2. Ferguson (1978) p.308
3. Hansard, Third Series, Vol.CX, column 697, Commons, 23rd Alril 1850
4. Ward (1965) p.152
5. Hansard, Third Series, Vol.CXII, column 1499, Commons, 18th July 1850
6. Roach (1959) p.134
7. Blue Book (1852) XXII, p.3
8. Blue Book (1852-3) XLIV,
9. Ward (1965) p.156
10. Simon (1974) p.293
11. Quoted in Faber (1957) p.197
12. Engel (1983) p.13
13. Morley (1903) p.499
14. Blue Book (1852) XXII, p.260
15. Simon (1965) p.295
16. Engel (1983) p.35
17. Reader (1966) p.129
18. Blue Book (1852) XXII, p.99
19. Blue Book (1852) XXII p.100
20. Reader (1966) p.110
21. Simon (1965) p.295
22. Hansard, Third Series, Vol.132, column 975, Commons, 27th April 1854
23. Berdahl (1959) p.33, f-n.46
24. Armytage (1955) p.203
25. Armytage (1955) p.205
26. Kitson Clark (1965) p.43
27. Hughes (1942) p.62
28. Trevelyan Papers, B.L. Mss.1193, Dep d 122, page 92 letter dated 31st October 1853

29. Trevelyan Papers, B.L. Mss. 1193 Dep d 122, page 104
letter dated 11th November 1854
30. Macaulay Manuscripts, T.C.L. Press Mark O.15.12.161
letter dated 11th July 1854
31. Moore (1964) p.248
32. Macaulay Manuscripts, T.C.L. Press Mark O.15.12.188
letter dated 9th January 1855
33. Hickleton Papers, A.4.60
letter dated 19th January 1855 (See C.U.L. Microfilm Mss 1498)
34. Blue Book (1854-55) XL, p.113
35. Beyer (1967) p.243 (N.B. Galloway should read Galway. Error in Beyer)
36. Young (1960) p.98
37. Dewey (1973) p.263
38. Annan (1955) p.243
39. Annan (1955) p.244
40. Annan (1955) p.247
41. Blue Book (1854-55) XL, p.115
42. Beyer (1967) p.243
43. The Times, 22nd November 1855, page 6, column 4
44. Cohn (1966) p.110
45. Harvie (1977) p.97
46. The Edinburgh Evening Courant, 5th April 1856, page 2
letter to the Editor signed Omega (Kilgour claimed to be the author in letter written in 1856. See Blackie letters in N.L.S. Mss 2624, f.198 letter dated 25th November 1856)
47. Beyer (1967) p.243
48. Kellner and Crowther-Hunt (1980) p.105
49. Clive (1981) p.313
50. Compton (1968) p.268
51. Compton (1968) p.266
52. The Saturday Review, Vol.6. No.151, 18th September 1858, page 1
53. E.U.L. Pamphlets, Q.P. 1222/22. Circular of the Association of the Scottish Universities dated March 1855
54. Cowan (1946) p.348

55. The Witness 15th April 1854, page 2
56. The Scotsman, 24th May 1854
57. Hanham (1967) p.176
58. Cowan (1946) p.348
59. Anderson (1983) p.54
60. Lorimer (1854) passim
61. Lorimer (1854) p.83
62. Lorimer (1858) p.93
63. Anderson (1983) p.63
64. Anderson (1983) p.74
65. E.U.L. Pamphlets, Q.P. 1222/26
    letter from Lorimer to Lord Provost dated 29th October 1855
66. Horn (1959) p.179
67. The Scotsman,
68. The Times, 2nd January 1858 page 8, column 4
69. The Times, 4th January 1858 page 6, column 5
70. The Scotsman 9th January 1858
71. Hanham (1970) p.XXX
72. Horn (1959) p.180
73. Grant (1884) Vol.II, p.94
74. Blue Book (1857-58) IV, p.697
75. Anderson (1983) p.70
76. Davie (1981) p.66
77. Inglis (1866) p.60
78. Davie (1981) p.67
79. Armytage (1955) p.212
80. Brewster (1864) p.6
81. Davie (1961) p.68
82. Simon (1974) p.349
83. Morrell and Thackray (1982) p.33
84. Morrell and Thackray (1982) p.26
85. Brewster (1864) p.19
86. Rothblatt (1968) p.258
87. Rothblatt (1968) p.259
88. Perkin (1969b) p.6

89. Lorimer (1858) p.93
90. Lorimer (1858) p.93
91. Rothblatt (1982) p.19

Chapter Five. The Scottish Universities Commission of 1876 and 1889 and the development of a two-tier University System in England

1. Smith (1966) p.6
2. Myers (1972) p.87
3. MacGilvray (1919) p.8
4. The Scotsman, 18th December 1875
5. The Times, 29th April 1876, page 9, column 6
6. Blue Book (1878) XXXII, Vol.1, page 1
7. Crapster (1957) p.355
8. Hanham (1959) p.162
9. Watt (1893) p.186/7
10. Davie (1981) p.81
11. Watt (1893) p.187
12. Davie (1981) p.81
13. Davie (1981) p.77
14. Davie (1981) p.91
15. Davie (1981) p.90
16. Hansard, Third Series, Vol.CCXIV, column 1460, Commons, 6th March 1873
17. Mitchison (1980) p.142, f-n.22
18. Davie (1981) p.84
19. Bibby (1959) p.140
20. Howarth (1931) p.64
21. Morrell and Thackray (1981) p.395
22. Blue Book (1877) VII, p.193
23. Armytage (1955) p.232
24. Sanderson (1972) p.36
25. Sanderson (1983) p.41
26. Charlton (1951) p.26
27. Sanderson (1983) p.46

28. Charlton (1951) p.27
29. Thompson (1886) p.122
30. Charlton (1951) p.33
31. Charlton (1951) p.36
32. Armytage (1955) p.220
33. The Manchester Guardian, 9th July 1858, page 2, column 3
34. Ashby (1958) p.57
35. Cardwell (1972) p.115
36. Blue Book (1867-68) XV, p.91
37. Blue Book (1867-68) XV, p.IX
38. Arnold (1868) p.290
39. Cardwell (1972) p.122
40. Blue Book (1873) XXVIII, p.690
41. Cardwell (1972) p.126
42. Armytage (1955) p.221
43. Armytage (1955) p.224
44. Whiting (1932) p.189
45. Fowler (1904) p.205
46. Quoted in Sanderson (1975) p.166
47. Shimmin (1954) p.11
48. Leeds Mercury, 1st May 1874, page 3, column 3
49. Stephens (1975) p.247
50. Stephens (1975) p.248
51. Shimmin (1954) p.14
52. Quoted in The Leeds Mercury, 7th October 1875, page 6, column 3
53. Draper (1912) p.90
54. Cottle and Sherbourne (1959) p.7
55. Percival (1873) p.8
56. Blue Book (1881) LVI, p.155
57. Cottle and Sherbourne (1959) p.8
58. Harvie (1976) p.206
59. Smith (1982) p.217
60. Smith (1982) p.216/7
61. Huxley (1881) p.7
62. Armytage (1955) p.226

63. Sanderson (1972) p.82
64. Jones (1985) p.211
65. Halsey (1957) p.148
66. Davie (1981) p.90
67. Andrews (1867) p.87
68. Playfair (1873) p.10
69. Anderson (1983) p.252
70. Donaldson (1911) p.108
71. Rosebery Papers, N.L.S. Mss.10,077, ff.341
    letter dated 24th December 1881
72. Jack (1883) p.51
73. Rosebery Papers, N.L.S. Mss.10,034, f.206
    letter dated 16th March 1883
74. Rosebery Papers, N.L.S. Mss.10,034, f.210
    letter dated 17th March 1883
75. Rosebery Papers, N.L.S. Mss.10,034, f.211
    letter dated 19th March 1883
76. The Times, 24th April 1883, page 10, column 4
77. Jack (1883) p.53
78. Lothian Papers, S.R.O. G.D. 40/16/2/17
    letter dated 21st June 1883
79. Lothian Papers, S.R.O. G.D. 40/16/2/23
    letter dated 2nd July 1883
80. The Times, 30th May 1885, page 12, column 1
81. Ferguson (1978) p.327
82. Hanham (1965) p.215
83. Hanham (1965) p.216
84. Gladstone Papers, B.M. Add. Mss.44,199, ff.122-127
    letter dated 11th December 1884
85. Salisbury Correspondence, H.H. Mss.3 M/E, f.31
    letter dated 16th July 1887
86. Salisbury Correspondence, H.H. Mss.3 M/e, f.58
    letter dated 10th March 1888
87. Salisbury Correspondence, H.H. Mss.3 M/E, f.73
    letter dated 17th May 1888

88. Cochrane-Patrick Papers, W.K. Bundle 1
letter dated 23rd May 1888
89. Rosebery Papers, N.L.S. Mss.10,014, f.113
letter dated 25th May 1888
90. The Times, 30th March 1888 page 5, column 3
91. The Scotsman, 23rd March 1888 page 4
92. The Times, 8th May 1888 page 9, column 4
93. Donaldson (1911) p.93
94. Davie (1981) p.98
95. Blue Book (1889) VIII, p.459
96. Blue Book (1889) VIII, p.503
97. Davie (1981) p.98
98. Hansard, Third Series, Vol. CCCXXXVIII, column 1208, Commons
24th July 1889
99. Sanderson (1972) p.156
100. Sanderson (1972) p.156
101. Sanderson (1972) p.182
102. Sanderson (1972) p.182
103. Davie (1981) p.76
104. Davie (1981) p.92
105. McWhirter (1981) p.204
106. Mitchison (1980) p.139
107. Grierson (1938) p.11
108. Armytage (1955) p.233
109. Mackie (1954) p.294
110. University Grants Committee Papers, P.R.O. U.G.C. 2/15 D
Confidential Memorandum
111. Anderson (1983) p.270
112. Davie (1981) p.79
113. Anderson (1983) p.271
114. Davie (1981) p.79
115. Davie (1981) p.80
116. The Times, 5th March 1887, page 15, column 6
117. Hansard, Third Series, Vol. CCCXI, column 1383, Commons,
7th March 1887

118. The Times, 12th March 1887, page 4, column 6
119. Armytage (1955) p.235
120. Blue Book (1889) LIX, p.355
121. Blue Book (1889) LIX, p.357
122. Blue Book (1889) LIX, p.357
123. Blue Book (1892) LX, p.365
124. Blue Book (1892) LX, p.367
125. Blue Book (1889) LIX, p.353
126. Blue Book (1892) LX, p.367

Chapter Six. Conclusion

1. Nairn (1977) p.106
2. Ferguson (1978) p.204
3. Reader (1966) p.136
4. Anderson (1983) p.341
5. Perkin (1969a) p.51
6. Engel (1983) p.11
7. Wiener (1981) p.135
8. Rothblatt (1968) p.256
9. Wiener (1981) p.9
10. Wiener (1981) p.24
11. Ben-David and Zloczower (1962) p.52
12. Young (1965) p.96
13. Williams (1980) p.346
14. Young (1971) p.29
15. Robertson (1976) p.474

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources

B.L. Bodleian Library, Oxford. Department of Western Manuscripts
Trevelyan Papers, Mss 1193

B.M. British Museum, London. Department of Manuscripts
Aberdeen Papers, Add Mss 43,202
Gladstone Papers, Add Mss 44,199
Peel Papers, Add Mss 40,339

C.U.L. Cambridge University Library, Cambridge. Manuscripts Room
Hickleton Papers, Microfilm Mss 1498

E.U.L. Edinburgh University Library, Edinburgh. Special Collection
Pamphlets Q.P. 1222

H.H. Hatfield House, Hatfield, Herts.
Salisbury Correspondence Mss 3 M/E

P.R.O. Public Records Office, Kew.
Home Office Papers H.O. 102/36
H.O. 102/37
H.O. 102/42
University Grants Committee Papers U.G.C. 2

N.L.S. National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh
Blackie Letters N.L.S. Mss 2624
Rosebery Papers N.L.S. Mss 10014
Mss 10034
Mss 10077
+ N.L.S. Mss 2904

S.R.O. Scottish Records Office, Edinburgh
Lothian Papers S.R.O G.D. 40/16

T.C.L. Trinity College Library, Cambridge
Macaulay Manuscripts Press Mark O.15.12

W.K. Hunterston House, West Kilbride
Cochrane-Patrick Papers

Official Publications

Hansard Parliamentary Debates, Third Series

Blue Book (1831) XII — Report made to His Majesty by a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the State of the Universities of Scotland

Blue Book (1852) XXII — Report of the Commission appointed to Inquiry into the State, Discipline, Studies and Revenues of the University of Oxford

Blue Book (1852-53) XLIV — Report of the Commission appointed to Inquiry into the State, Discipline, Studies and Revenue of the University of Cambridge

Blue Book (1854-55) XL — Report on the Indian Civil Service from the Committee requested to consider the Examination of Candidates for the Civil Service of the East India Company

Blue Book (1857-58) IV — Universities (Scotland) Bill

Blue Book (1867-68) XV — Report from the Select Committee on Scientific Instruction

Blue Book (1873) XXVIII — Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction and the Advancement of Science

Blue Book (1877) VII — A Bill to make Further Provision respecting the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and the Colleges therein

Blue Book (1878) XXXII — Report of the Royal Commissioners appointed to Inquiry into the Universities of Scotland

Blue Book (1881) LVI — Minutes of Evidence taken by the Oxford Commissioners

Blue Book (1889) VIII — A Bill for the better Administration and Endowment of the Universities of Scotland

Blue Book (1889) LIX — Memorandum of the Lord President of the Council and the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the appropriation of a Grant . . . for University Colleges

Blue Book (1889) LIX — Treasury Minute . . . on the same subject

Blue Book (1892) LX — Report of the Committee on Grants to University Colleges in Great Britain

Newspapers and Journals

The Aberdeen University Magazine, Aberdeen
The Edinburgh Evening Courant, Edinburgh
The Leeds Mercury, Leeds
The Manchester Guardian, Manchester
The Saturday Review, London
The Scotsman, Edinburgh
The Times, London
The Witness, Edinburgh

Books and Articles

Anderson, P.S.
1902 'Rectorial Addresses delivered at the University of Aberdeen, 1835-1900' Aberdeen, Aberdeen University Press

Anderson, R.D.
1983 'Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland: Schools and Universities' Oxford, Clarenden Press

Andrews, Thomas
1867 'Studium Generale' London, Longman, Green & Co

Annan, Noel G.
1955 'The Intellectual Aristocracy' in 'Studies in Social History- a Tribute to G.M. Trevelyan' edited by J.H. Plumb London, Longman, Green & Co

Armytage, Walter H.G.
1955 'The Civic Universities; aspects of a British Tradition' London, Benn

Arnold, Matthew
1868 'Schools and Universities on the Continent' London, Macmillan & Co

Ashby, Eric
1958 'Technology and the Academics; An Essay on Universities and the Scientific Revolution' London, Macmillan & Co

Ashby, Eric
1966 'Universities; British, Indian, African' Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press

Barrington Moore Jnr
1966 'Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy; Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World' Boston, Mass. Beacon Press

Bellot, H. Hale
1929 'University College, London' London, University of London Press

Ben-David, J. and Zloczower, A.
1962 'Universities and Academic Systems in Modern Societies' in European Journal of Sociology, Vol.3, p.4

Berdahl, Robert O.
1959 'British Universities and the State' Los Angeles, University of California Press

Beyer, John T.
1967 'Patronage and Education in the East India Company Civil Service, 1800-1857' Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh M. Litt. thesis

Bibby, Cyril

1959 'The Role of T.H. Huxley in the Development of Universities in the Nineteenth century' in Educational Review, Vol.11

Brewster, David

1864 'Inroductory Address . . at the opening session 1864-5 at the University of Edinburgh' Edinburgh, Maclachlan & Stewart

Briggs, Asa

1963 'Review of 'The Democratic Intellect' by G.E. Davie' in English Historical Review, Vol.78, No.308, p.568, July, 1963

Camic, Charles

1983 'Experience and Enlightenment; Socialization for Cultural Change in Eighteenth Century Scotland' Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press

Cannon, John

1984 'Aristocratic Century. The Peerage of Eighteenth Century England' Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Cant, Ronald Gordon

1967 The Scottish Universities and Scottish society in the eighteenth century' in Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth century (edited by T. Besterman), LVIII, 1967, p.1953

Cant, Ronald Gordon

1970a'The University of St Andrews; a short history' Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press

Cant, Ronald Gordon

1970b'The Scottish Universities in the seventeenth century' in Aberdeen University Review, Vol.XLIII,3, No.143

Cardwell, Donald Stephen Lowell

1972 'The Organization of Science in England. A Retrospect' London, William Heinemann

Charlton, Henry Buckley

1951 'Portrait of a University, 1851-1951; to commemorate the centenary of Manchester University' Manchester, Manchester University Press

Chitnis, Anand C.

1976 'The Scottish Enlightenment; a social history' London, Croom Helm

Clive, John

1981 'Peter and the Wallah: From Kinsfolk to Competition' in 'History of Imagination. Essays in honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper' edited by H. Lloyd-Jones, V. Pearly and B. Warden.London, Duckworth

Cohn, Bernard S.

1966 'Recruitment and Training of British Civil Servants in India, 1600-1860' in 'Asian Bureaucratic Systems Emergent from British Imperial Tradition' edited by R. Braibanti Durham, N.C. Duke University Press

Collins, Randall

1979 'The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification' New York, Academic Press

Collins, Randall

1977 'Some Comparative Principles of Educational Stratification' in Harvard Educational Review, Vol.47, No.1

Compton, J.M.

1968 'Open Competition and the I.C.S.,1854-76' in English Historical Review, LXXXIII, p.261

Cottle, Basil and Sherbourne, J.W.

1959 'The Life of a University' Bristol, J.W. Arrowsmith Ltd.

Coulton, G.G.

1935 'Nationalism in the Middle Ages' in The Cambridge Historical Journal, Vol.V, p.15

Coutts, James

1909 'A History of the University of Glasgow from its foundation in 1451 to 1909' Glasgow, James Maclehose & Sons

Cowan, Robert M.W.
1946 'The Newspaper in Scotland- A Study of its first Expansion, 1815-1860' Glasgow, Geo. Outran & Co

Crapster, Basil I.
1957 'Scotland and the Conservative Party in 1876' in Journal of Modern History, Vol.XXIX, p.355

Curtis, S.J.
1948 'History of Education in Great Britain' London, University Tutorial Press

Davie, George Elder
1961 'The Democratic Intellect. Scotland and her Universities in the Nineteenth Century' Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press

Davie, George Elder
1981 'The Democratic Intellect. Scotland and her Universities in the Nineteenth Century' Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press. Paperback edition

Dewey, C.J.
1973 'The Education of a Ruling Class: the Indian Civil Service in the era of Competitive Examination' in The English Historical Review, Vol.88, No.347 p.262

Dickerson, William Croft
1961 'Scotland from the earliest times to 1603' Edinburgh, Thos. Nelson & Son Ltd

Donaldson, Sir James
1911 'Addresses delivered in the University of St Andrews from 1886 to 1910' Edinburgh, Printed for T.and A. Constable at Edinburgh University Press

Draper, William
1912 'Sir Nathan Bodington -First Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leeds- A Memoir' London, Macmillan & Co

Emerson, Roger L.
1977 'Scottish Universities in the Eighteenth Century, 1690-1800' in Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century, Vol. CLXVII

Engel, Arthur J.
1983 'From Clergyman to Don -The Rise of the Academic Profession in Nineteenth Century Oxford' Oxford, Clarenden Press

Faber, Geoffrey
1957 'Jowett- a portrait with background' London, Faber & Faber Ltd

Ferguson, W.
1978 'Scotland- 1689 to the Present' Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd

Fowler, J.T.
1904 'Durham University- earlier foundations and present colleges' London, F.E. Robinson

Furniss, Normam
1976 'Internal Colonialism: Its Utility for Understanding the Development of Higher Education in Scotland' in Development and Change, Vol.7 p.445

Garland, Martha M.
1980 'Cambridge before Darwin: The Ideal of a Liberal Education, 1800-1860' Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Gash, Norman
1961 'Mr Secretary Peel, The Life of Sir Robert Peel to 1830' London, Longman, Green & Co

Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C. Wright (editors)
1947 'From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology' London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co

Graham, Henry Grey
1969 'The Social Life in Scotland in the Eighteenth Century' London, Adam & Charles Black

Grant, Sir Alexander
1884 'The Story of the University of Edinburgh during its first three hundred years' London, Longman, Green & Co

Grant, Nigel
1981 'The British Isles as an Area of Study in Comparative Education' in Compare, Vol.11, No.2

Green, V.H.H.
1969 'The Universities' Harmondsworth, Penguin

Grierson, Herbert John Clifford
1938 'The University and Liberal Education' Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd

Halsey, A.H.
1957 'British Universities and Intellectual Life' in Universities Quarterly, Vol.12, p.141

Halsey, A.H.
1962 'British Universities' in Archives Europeenes de Sociologie (European Journal of Sociology) Vol.111, No.1

Hanham, H.J.
1959 'Elections and Party Management - Politics in the time of Disraeli and Gladstone' London, Longmans, Green & Co

Hanham, H.J.
1965 'The Creation of the Scottish Office, 1881-7' in The Juridical Review, Vol.10 (New Series) p.205

Hanham, H.J.
1967 'Mid-century Scottish Nationalism: Romantic and Radical' in R. Robson (Editor) 'Ideas and Institutions of Britain' London, Bell & Son

Hanham, H.J.
1970 'Editors Introduction to Henry Thomas Buckle's 'On Scotland and the Scotch Intellect' Chicago, University of Chicago Press

Hanham, H.J.
1975 'Cambridge History -review of Sheldon Rothblatt's 'The Revolution of the Dons' in History of Education Quarterly, Vol.XV, No.3

Harvie, Christopher
1976 'The Lights of Liberalism- University Liberals and the Challenge to Democracy 1860-86' London, Allan Lane

Harvie, Christopher
1977 'Scotland and Nationalism' London, G. Allen & Unwin

Hearnshaw, F.J.C.

1929 'The Centenary History of King's College London 1828-1928' London, G. Harrup & Co

Hexter, J.H.

1961 'Reappraisals in History' London, Longmans

Hill, Christopher

1972 'The Radical Critics of Oxford and Cambridge in the 1650s' in 'Universities in Politics' edited by J.W. Baldwin and R.H. Goldthwaite. Baltimore, John Hopkins Press

Horn, D.B.

1959 'The Universities (Scotland) Act of 1858' in University of Edinburgh Journal, Vol.XIX, No.3

Horn, D.B.

1967 'A Short History of the University of Edinburgh, 1556-1889' Edinburgh,

Horn, D.B.

1962 'Review of 'The Democratic Intellect' in Scottish Historical Review, Vol.41, No.131, p.82

Houghton, Walter E.

1957 'The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870' New Haven, Conn. Yale University Press

Howarth, O.J.R.

1931 'The British Association for the Advancement of Science: a retrospect, 1831-1931' London, Percy Lunn, Humphries & Co

Hughes, Edward

1942 'Civil Service Reform 1853-5' in History, Vol.XXVII, p.51

Hutchinson, Eric

1975 'The Origins of the University Grants Committee' in Minerva, Vol.13, No.4

Huxley, Thomas Henry

1881 'Science and Culture- An Address delivered at the Opening of Sir Josiah Mason's Science College at Birmingham' in 'Science and Culture and Other Essays'London, Macmillan & Co

Inglis, John
1866 'English and Scotch Universities' in The Museum, Vol.3, New Series, p.57

Jack, Prof. William
1883 'The Scotch Universities Bill' in Macmillan's Magazine, Vol.XLVIII, p.50

Jenkins, Hester and Jones, D. C.
1950 'Social Class of Cambridge University Alumni of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries' in British Journal of Sociology, Vol.1, p.93

Jones, David R.
1985 'Victorian Civic Universities: Essay review of Thomas Kelly's 'For Advancement of Learning: The University of Liverpool, 1881-1981' and R.B. McDowell and D.A. Webb's 'Trinity College, Dublin, 1592-1952' in History of Education Quarterly, Vol.25, Nos.1 & 2

Kearney, Hugh
1970 'Scholars and Gentlemen: Universities and Society in pre-industrial Britain, 1500-1700' Ithaca, N.Y. Cornell University Press

Kellner, P. and Crowther-Hunt, Lord
1980 'The Civil Servants: An Inquiry into Britain's Ruling Class' London, MacDonald General Books

King, Ronald,
1980 'Weberian Perspectives and the Study of Education' in British Journal of the Sociology of Education, Vol.1, No.1

Kitson Clark, G.
1965 'The Making of Victorian England' London, University Paperback

Lorimer, James
1854 'The Universities of Scotland: Past, Present and Possible' Edinburgh, W.P. Kennedy

Lorimer, James
1858 'Scottsh University Reform' in The Edinburgh Review, Vol.107

Lyte, H.C. Maxwell
1886 'A History of the University of Oxford from the Earliest Times to the Year 1530' London, Macmillan & Co

MacGilivray, Duncan

1919 'Fifty Years of Scottish Education' in 'Problems of National Education' edited by John Clarke, London, Macmillan & Co

Mackie, J.D.

1954 'The University of Glasgow, 1451-1951. A short History' Glasgow, Jackson, Son & Co

MacNalty, Sir A.

1947 'The Renaissance and its influence on English Medicine' in Annals of the Royal College of Surgeons, p.8

McWhirter, Norris (Editor)

1981 'Guiness Book of Records' Enfield, Middlesex, Guinness Superlatives Ltd.

Mathew, W.M.

1966 'The Origins and Occupations of Glasgow Students, 1740-1839' in Past and Present, No.33 p.74

Mitchison, Rosalind

1980 'Nineteenth Century Scottish Nationalism : the Cultural Background' in 'The Roots of Nationalism: Studies in Northern Europe ' edited by R. Mitchison. Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers Ltd

Moore, R.J.

1964 'The Abolition of Patronage in the I.C.S. and the closure of Haileybury College' in Historical Journal Vol.VII

Morley, J.

1903 'The Life of William Ewart Gladstone' London, Macmillan & Co

Morrell, J.B.

1968 'Thomas Thomson: Professor of Chemistry and University Reformer' in The British Journal for the History of Science, Vol.4, No.15

Morrell, J.B.

1972 'Science and Scottish University Reform : Edinburgh in 1826' in The British Journal for the History of Science, Vol.6, No.21

Morrell, Jack and Thackray, Arnold
1982 'Gentlemen of Science: early years of the British Association for the Advancement of Science' Oxford, Clarendon Press

Myers, J.D.
1972 'Scottish Nationalism and the Antecedents of the 1872 Education Act' in Scottish Educational Studies, Vol.4

Nairn, T.
1977 'The Break-Up of Britain' London, NLB.

Nicholson, R.
1974 'Scotland - the later Middle Ages' Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd

Omond, George W.T.
1883 'The Lord Advocates of Scotland- from the close of the fifteenth century to . . .' Edinburgh, David Douglas

Percival, Rev. J
1873 'The Connection of the Universities and the Great Towns' London, Macmillan & Co

Perkin, Harold J.
1969a'The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880' London, Routledge & Kegan Paul

Perkin, Harold
1969b'Key Professions: The History of the Association of University Teachers' London, Routledge & Kegan Paul

Phillipson, Nicholas
1981 'The Scottish Enlightenment' in 'The Enlightnment in National Context' edited by R. Porter and M. Teich Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Phillipson, N.T.
1974 'Culture and Society in the Eighteenth Century Province: The Case of Edinburgh and the Scottish Enlightenment' in 'The University in Society' VolII edited by Lawrence Stone, London, Princeton University Press

Playfair, Lyon
1873 'Universities in the relation to Professional Education' Edinburgh, Edmonston & Douglas

Porter, Roy
1986 'English Society in the Eighteenth Century' Harmsworth, Pelican Books

Rait, Robert S.
1895 'The Universities of Aberdeen. A History' Aberdeen, James Gordon Bisset

Rashdall, Hastings
1936 'The Universities of the Middle Ages' Oxford, Clarendon Press

Reader, W.J.
1966 'Professional Men: The Rise of the Professional Classes in Nineteenth Century England' London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson

Rendall, Jane
1974 'The Origins of the Scottish Enlightenment' London, Macmillan Press

Ringer, Fritz
1979 'Education and Society in Modern Europe' Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University Press

Roach, John
1959 'Victorian Universities and the National Intelligentsia' in Victorian Studies, Vol.3

Robertson, Paul L.
1976 'The Finances of the University of Glasgow before 1914' in History of Education Quarterly, Vol.16, No.4

Rothblatt, Sheldon
1968 'The Revolution of the Dons. Cambridge and Society in Victorian England' London, Faber & Faber

Rothblatt, Sheldon
1976 'Tradition and Change in English Liberal Education- An Essay in History and Culture' London, Faber & Faber

Rothblatt, Sheldon,
1982 'Failure in Early Nineteenth Century Oxford and Cambridge' in History of Education Vol.11, No.1

Sanderson, Micheal
1972 'The Universities and British Industry, 1850-1970' London, Routledge & Kegan Paul

Sanderson, Micheal (editor)
1975 'The Universities in the Nineteenth Century' London, Routledge & Kegan Paul

Sanderson, Micheal
1983 'Education, Economic Change and Society in England- 1780 -1870' London, Macmillan Press Ltd

Saunders, Laurance James
1950 'Scottish Democracy, 1815-1840' Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd

Shapin, Steven
1975 'Phrenological Knowledge and the Social Structure of Early Nineteenth Century Edinburgh' in Annals of Science, Vol.32, p.219

Shapin, Steven and Thackray, Arnold
1974 'Prosopography as a Research Tool in History of Science: The British Scientific Community 1700-1900' in History of Science, Vol.XII, p.1

Shimmin, A.N.
1954 'The University of Leeds- The First Half-century' Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Simon, Brian
1961 'Review of 'The Democratic Intellect' in Victorian Studies Vol.V, No.2

Simon, Brian
1974 'The Two Nations and the Educational Structure, 1780-1870' London, Lawrence & Wishart

Smith, Dennis
1982 'Conflict and Compromise- Class Formation in English Society 1830-1914' London, Routledge & Kegan Paul

Smith, F.B.
1966 'The Making of the Second Reform Bill' Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Smout, T.C.
1969 'A History of the Scottish People, 1560-1830' London, Collins

Smout, T.C.

1978 'Provost Drummond' Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Extra-Mural Department

Smout, T.C.

1980 'Scotland and England: Is Dependency a Symptom or a Cause of Underdevelopment?' in Review, a Journal of the Fernand Braudel Centre, Vol.III, No.4

Stephens, W.B.

1975 'The Curriculum. The Yorkshire College of Science' in Studies in the History of a University - Leeds' edited by P.H.J.H. Gosden, and A.J. Taylor. Leeds, Arnold & Sons

Stone, Lawrence

1971 'Prosopography' in Daedalus, Vol.100, No.1

Stone, Lawrence

1974 'The Size and Composition of the Oxford Student Body, 1580-1910' in 'The University in Society' edited by L. Stone. London, Princeton Press

Storr, Richard J.

1963 'Review of 'The Democratic Intellect' in Journal of Modern History, Vol.34

Sutherland, (Dame) Lucy

1973 'The University of Oxford in the Eighteenth Century' Oxford, Oxford University Press

Thompson, F.M.L.

1963 'English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century' London,

Thompson, Joseph

1886 'Owen's College- its foundation and growth' Manchester, J.E. Cornish

Trevelyan, G.M.

1984 'English Social History' Harmondsworth, Penguin Books

Trevor-Roper, Hugh

1967 'The Scottish Enlightenment' in Studies on Voltaire and the eighteenth century, Vol.LVIII, p.1635

Vaughan, M. and Archer, M.S.

1971 'Social Conflict and Educational Change in England and France,1789-1848' Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Ward, W.R.
1965 'Victorian Oxford' London, Frank Cass & Co

Watt, J.C.
1893 'Memoir of Lord President Inglis' Edinburgh, William Green & Son

Webb, Keith
1978 'The Growth of Nationalism in Scotland' Harmondsworth, Penguin Books

Whiting, C.E.
1932 'The University of Durham, 1832-1932' London, The Sheldon Press

Wiener, Martin
1981 'English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980' Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Williams, Raymond.
1980 'The Long Revolution' Harmondsworth, Penguin Books

Withrington, Donald J.
1961 'Raw, Pungent Spirit -review of 'The Democratic Intellect' in Universities Quarterly, Vol.16, No.1

Withrington, Donald J.
1970 'Education and Society in the Eighteenth Century' in 'Scotland in the Age of Improvement' edited by R. Mitchison and N. Phillipson. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press

Withrington, Donald J.
1983 'Scotland- a half Educated Nation' in 1834? Reliable Critique or Persuasive Polemic' in 'Scottish Culture and Scottish Education' edited by Walter M. Humes and Hamish M. Paterson. Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers

Wright, C.J.
1979 'Academics and their Aims: English and Scottish Approaches to University Education in the Nineteenth Century' in History of Education, Vol.8, No.2

Young, G.M.
1960 'Victorian England: Portrait of an Age' Oxford, Oxford University Press

Young, Michael F.D.

1971 'An Approach to the Study of Curricula as Socially Organized Knowledge' in 'Knowledge and Control' edited by M.F.D. Young. London, Collier-Macmillan